




3 1761 11631021 0



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761116310210>





120N  
X1  
-D23



No. 13

N° 13

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 40<sup>th</sup> Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 40<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Tuesday 21 February 2012

Mardi 21 février 2012



Speaker  
Honourable Dave Levac

Président  
L'honorable Dave Levac

Clerk  
Deborah Deller

Greffière  
Deborah Deller

### **Hansard on the Internet**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

### **Le Journal des débats sur Internet**

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

### **Renseignements sur l'index**

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services  
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building  
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park  
Toronto ON M7A 1A2  
Telephone 416-325-7400; fax 416-325-7430  
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service du Journal des débats et d'interprétation  
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement  
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park  
Toronto ON M7A 1A2  
Téléphone, 416-325-7400; télécopieur, 416-325-7430  
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 21 February 2012

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 21 février 2012

*The House met at 0900.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Welcome back. Please join me in prayer.

*Prayers.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Please observe a moment of silence.

*The House observed a moment's silence.*

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### ATTRACTING INVESTMENT AND CREATING JOBS ACT, 2012

#### LOI DE 2012 VISANT À ATTIRER LES INVESTISSEMENTS ET À CRÉER DES EMPLOIS

Resuming the debate adjourned on December 6, 2011, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 11, An Act respecting the continuation and establishment of development funds in order to promote regional economic development in eastern and south-western Ontario / Projet de loi 11, Loi concernant la prorogation et la création de fonds de développement pour promouvoir le développement économique régional dans l'Est et le Sud-Ouest de l'Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further debate?

**Mr. Monte McNaughton:** It's an honour to rise and offer feedback and comments on Bill 11 on behalf of the official opposition, and it's an honour to be back in this House after a long, long break. We haven't been here since December 8. So let me take a moment to wish you a happy new year, Speaker, and to all MPPs on both sides of the House: Happy new year and all the best in 2012.

Over the break, I did what I'm sure many members in this House did. I returned to my riding of Lambton-Kent-Middlesex and spent time with my family and friends and within my community and across the riding. I spoke with members of the community, business and government leaders throughout. I met with entrepreneurs, small businesses, major corporations and large employers. I met with education and development heads, and I met with regular, everyday people: farmers, retirees, shift workers and the unemployed. I even met with Liberals, I met with Conservatives and people of all political stripes. And do you know what virtually every person told me, Mr. Speaker? Things in Ontario need to change. They told me that Ontario needs to take a new course and needs to go in a completely new direction. Over the past

couple of months, the people have told me that they don't want more of the same and that they don't want to keep going down the same path, down the same road that we are currently heading.

It is a great privilege for me to speak so early in the day here today, our first day back, to clearly state to the government some of the many flaws with its current approach, including with this very bill, Bill 11. This bill, bluntly, is another McGuinty spend bill. In fact, it will cost \$160 million. You see, Mr. Speaker, with everything I've heard since we were last in this House, from the community, from local elected officials and municipal governments and, indeed, from the government's own consultant, Don Drummond, I'm more certain than ever that things need to change and that it is time to adapt some of the straightforward and common-sense principles being put forward by the Ontario PC caucus and by our leader, Tim Hudak.

Since 2003, the Liberal government tells us that they have worked closely with the business community and the regional economic development partners to attract new investment and create jobs for Ontario families. The McGuinty government has also told the people of Ontario that they have partnered with companies that are making investments in Ontario and creating jobs. I've even heard some of my friends on the government side talk about their so-called record of economic successes. But, unfortunately, for too many families, this couldn't be further from the truth and certainly does not reflect reality in Ontario today.

As you will know, under the current McGuinty government, Ontario has lost over 300,000 well-paying manufacturing jobs. And even, at one point, we were losing 100 jobs per hour—100 jobs per hour, Mr. Speaker; that is some very scary stuff. Almost 600,000 Ontario men and women remain out of work—600,000. Ontario is really struggling under Dalton McGuinty and this Liberal government. This, of course, is contributing to Ontario's jobless rate, which has remained above the national average for 61 straight months, or just over five years.

Those are some heavy numbers here first thing in the morning, Mr. Speaker, so let me distil it down for my friends on the government side. For over five years now, Ontario's jobless rate has remained above the national average for the entire country. That's right: The current government has been failing the people of Ontario—those looking for work, especially—for five years now. Worse than average; that's not something to be proud of, Mr. Speaker.

Unfortunately, I constantly see examples of unemployment in my riding of Lambton-Kent-Middlesex. You see, Speaker, as you know, southwestern Ontario and my riding have been especially hard hit with the downturn of the manufacturing sector. My constituents are coming to me every day, asking why the McGuinty government is doing nothing to repair the economy and nothing to help turn things around in Ontario and help get people back to work. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this is not an overstatement.

Let's go back just over the past few months, perhaps go back to the recent election on October 6, 2011. Since then, this government—the McGuinty government—has done one thing: nothing. They haven't brought forward one idea on how to reduce spending or how to save taxpayers any money. They haven't brought forward any ideas on how to create meaningful jobs in my riding or throughout the province of Ontario. They didn't even bother to form any legislative committees to allow for our traditional pre-budget consultations throughout Ontario.

Indeed, Speaker, with this speech from the throne, Premier McGuinty actually brought forward billions in new spending promises: \$2.5 billion in money we don't have and we simply cannot afford.

One thing that has happened since the election is, of course, the continued flow of companies closing shop and those good jobs leaving Ontario. As you will know, earlier this month in London, another 500 full-time jobs left the province. The Caterpillar plant shut down its London-based EMD facility. On top of the 500 jobs at Caterpillar, 1,700 spinoff jobs will be lost in southwestern Ontario—some very sad news for families in my riding and across the London region.

The McGuinty government spent a week attempting to blame anyone and everyone except the provincial government for these new job losses. First, Dalton McGuinty cast the blame at the feet of the company, claiming that it was never their intent to stay in Ontario. With hundreds of new Ontarians on the unemployment line, the Premier then stepped up his blame game and the Caterpillar plant closing became the fault of who? The federal government—as Premier McGuinty stated that Ottawa needed to review the Investment Canada Act to toughen restrictions on foreign ownership.

All this while Dalton McGuinty didn't even bother to pick up the phone and call the company or even bother to let them know that these jobs are important and that Ontario wants these jobs. But that's not all, Speaker. You see, a couple of days before the plant announced its closing, Dalton McGuinty was actually in London speaking to, of all groups, the London Chamber of Commerce. I guess you would think that with a major employer about to close shop and head south, the Premier might take a couple of minutes from his busy schedule to stop over and visit the local plant management—again, do whatever he could personally do to help keep these jobs in London, in Ontario, in Canada. But, no, not our Premier, who had to dash back to Toronto before even

bothering to speak with local plant management. Shameful, Speaker, shameful. No phone call and no visit with the management, and it's no wonder the plant closed to move south. It's no wonder we lost these jobs—these good jobs—because our Premier didn't do anything to stop it, didn't even put up a fight, Speaker.

**0910**

Well, unfortunately for the workers and all of southwestern Ontario, EMD is just a symptom in the greater disease plaguing the province's economy. Why is the McGuinty government not taking responsibility for the loss of these jobs? At the time that the plant closed, the Premier didn't do anything to try to stop the plant closure. The Premier was too busy to take a proactive approach and try to keep jobs right here in Ontario. Speaker, I'm confused: Is the McGuinty government too busy spending money that they can't be bothered to make a free phone call or set up a free meeting to save already-existing jobs?

Maybe it is not me that is confused, Speaker; I think it's the McGuinty government that is confused. I think it's the McGuinty government limping from one crisis to the next without any real plan, without any clue as to how to solve the problems facing our economy, the problems that their government has caused—and even worsened—with their lack of decisive action. It is time that the Premier takes responsibility for the province's job losses; 600,000 men and women across Ontario out of work today—shameful, Speaker. Dalton McGuinty needs to fix the disaster that he has created, and this is exactly what Don Drummond, the Premier's hand-picked consultant, has stated in his condemning report that was released just last week.

You see, Speaker, for a long time now the Ontario PC caucus and our leader, Tim Hudak, have been fighting to stop the damage, to stop the madness of the Dalton McGuinty Liberal government. We've been fighting to stop the chaos resulting from eight years of unsustainable spending increase after spending increase, eight years of rapid growth in the size of government, eight years of structural deficits compounding on themselves. Bill 11 is more of the same from the Dalton McGuinty government: more spending, more debt. Future generations have to pay this debt.

Indeed, the last eight years have brought skyrocketing increases in the government's overall expenditures. I'm sure I don't need to tell you, Speaker, but did you know that our spending is up over \$20 billion since the great recession? Coming from a family business, it is my experience that things should work opposite of that: that is, when money gets tight, spending must decrease and savings must be found—but apparently not so for Premier McGuinty.

The problem, of course, is that someone needs to pay for all of his spending and that someone is you and me and all the other hardworking people across Ontario. It is the taxpayers, the small businesses, the farmers, the truck drivers and store owners and factory workers who have to pay for Premier McGuinty's reckless spending spree.

However, we also know that their incomes haven't kept pace with the rapid increase in spending coming from this government. Ontario incomes, and incomes for folks in my riding of Lambton-Kent-Middlesex, have basically stagnated since this government came to office way back in 2003—not a record to be proud of. So while Ontario incomes remain the same, the cost of government has grown substantially and enormously, to the point that the Premier had to call in outside help to come in and review the books and help determine where things went off the tracks.

Let's remember back just a few months ago, to the recent election campaign and the lead up to the October 6 election, Speaker. I'm sure you can remember, as I can, when Premier McGuinty and this government boasted of being a steady hand in times of economic uncertainty; when Premier McGuinty asked the Ontario public to trust him yet once again and the public had their day and responded by yanking the Liberal mandate and electing a stronger opposition, sending a minority government back to Toronto. Since that day, we have had report after report rejecting the current path and rejecting the current Liberal government.

Speaker, think back just over the past couple of months and we've had the damning report from the Auditor General, the independent officer of this House: a non-partisan report that slammed this government in so many areas for mismanagement and waste. And of course, our monthly job numbers and report after report on the economy continued to leave a sour taste. Then there was Moody's—and don't forget the Conference Board of Canada report—and now we have the long-awaited Don Drummond report, the final sad, sorry repudiation of the McGuinty government's wasteful mismanagement.

The simple fact is, we would not be in the situation we are in, with high unemployment, ridiculous energy prices, skyrocketing debt and an uncontrollable deficit, if it were not for the Dalton McGuinty government—this government's mismanagement of our total economy. We wouldn't be here if it weren't for this government's uncontrolled spending.

The number \$411 billion is staring at us, Speaker. This is Dalton McGuinty's big debt number. This is his debt. Bill 11 adds to our debt and debt for families across the province of Ontario. Addictions are certainly nothing to make light of, but I cannot think of a better or more fair term to describe this government's spending habits other than to call them an addiction. Here we are again with this bill, Bill 11, calling for more spending, larger government and another charge into the old government credit card express, and it just keeps right on going: another \$2.5 billion since the election alone, which was only four months ago.

The recent Drummond report is a scathing report card on our provincial well-being, our current direction and leadership, and it's an eye-opener that we need to start doing business differently, that this government and future governments need to start doing business different-

ly. We simply cannot continue down the current path. We cannot proceed with the same failed Liberal policies. Drummond clearly states that it is time for new ideas and new approaches to how our government operates, and his over 700 pages are a road map that must be acted upon.

The document also provides proof of a very serious spending crisis—a crisis far worse than we imagined, worse than we ever thought and certainly worse than Premier McGuinty acknowledged.

Drummond also says that tough decisions will need to be made, that sacrifices will occur and that the remedial action required to get our financial house in order will be a tough pill to swallow. Despite this, Drummond says that we must act now, we must make changes or risk becoming the next Greece or Spain, hopelessly in debt and in complete and utter shambles.

Now we are back in the House, back to do the people's business and back to get Ontario on to the right track, and I am pleased to urge and challenge this government to do whatever is necessary and do what your own hand-picked expert says. Take the tough medicine that the doctor has prescribed and start putting the recommendations from the Drummond report into play, start making changes to the way we do government in Ontario.

But do you know what, Speaker? Nothing I've seen since this government has been elected gives me hope that they will or even can act on these important recommendations. It's no secret Ontarians have very little faith in this government to cut spending and reduce the size and overall cost of government and create jobs. It's just not in the Liberals' DNA. What we need is an immediate action plan from this government to clean up the mess—the mess that they created, the mess that they've allowed to grow and fester, untamed and unmanned. But that's not what we're going to get.

We're here today debating Bill 11, part of the same tired and washed-up approach that got us into this problem in the first place. The Ontario PC Party, the PC caucus, the official opposition party in this House—we understand what Don Drummond has stated. We understand what he has recommended and what he has prescribed for Ontario. While his report is detailed and covers numerous areas, the principles are really quite straightforward. We can't afford new spending.

First, only spend what you have. This is funny because this is something my parents taught me, and I'm sure this is something families across Ontario try to teach their children. Spend only what you have. Don't live on credit; don't live on debt, but instead, live within your means. Exercise self-control.

Second, prioritize spending on what really matters: health care and education. Stop with all the unnecessary extras, stop with all the unnecessary bloat and waste, the unnecessary pork that this government has fondly cultivated and grown, and spend our money on what is really important to the people of Ontario. Again, this is health care and education.

Third, and one of my favourite lessons coming from Don Drummond, reduce the size of government. Get

government out of all the areas that it has no business being in. Review and change the way government does business, reduce red tape and unnecessary burden. And for the government: Stick to your knitting.

0920

Speaker, forgive me if I say these things confidently, but this sounds like a discussion around the McNaughton dinner table when I was growing up. Even now, to this day, it sounds like a discussion we have at our family business, McNaughton's in Newbury. It sounds like a discussion families across Ontario have every day. Indeed, I've called on Dalton McGuinty to throw a quarantine around Ontario's economic purse. That's right: no more new spending promises, no new uncoded and one-off spending and no more growth in the size and cost of government.

Further, if this government refuses to act on even one of the recommendations contained within the Drummond report, they would need to come forward with equivalent alternatives or risk Ontario's bankruptcy and future health.

So here we are with Bill 11, and instead of trying to protect the jobs we currently have, the McGuinty government is using taxpayers' dollars to create a new stimulus program, a corporate welfare pork project known as the southwest development fund. But here's the funny thing, Speaker: For all the talk of the Don Drummond report and his approximately 400 recommendations to turn Ontario around, the very first thing we're doing here today is going directly against what Don Drummond has recommended. Indeed, Don Drummond, like Roger Martin before him, has stated that it's time to get Ontario out of the corporate welfare business and out of the business of giving unnecessary subsidies to businesses and corporations. Indeed, it is time to stop picking winners and losers from the Premier's office in downtown Toronto. This is a temporary, band-aid approach to job creation that will not create long-term economic growth, real growth.

Why is the government trying to create new jobs with taxpayer dollars while allowing current full-time jobs, like those at EMD in London, to leave our province? This out-of-control spending is troubling and upsetting. What is more troubling is that not only does the current government do nothing to keep current jobs in Ontario, they do nothing, period. They simply just spend money, blindly and aimlessly—just spend, spend, spend. I often wonder how Dalton McGuinty and his government can sleep peacefully at night while facing a debt of their making that's going to approach \$411 billion. Shameful, Speaker.

An interesting fact is that despite difficult economic circumstances, Ontario has seen some modest growth in the construction industry. You see, I recently met with the Canadian Federation of Independent Business about the WSIB and to discuss the increasing regulation that the construction industry is experiencing. A funny thing is that the McGuinty government's solution to growth seems to be to increase regulation, at least according to these industry leaders.

On January 1, Bill 119 came into effect, a bill that requires companies that employ construction workers to pay for the mandatory insurance that can only be done through the WSIB. On average, this will cost each business an additional \$11,000 per year in insurance premiums. Prior to Bill 119, construction companies were free to get private insurance that often included more comprehensive coverage at a better price than what the WSIB is providing. This new regulation will cost one of the few growing industries in Ontario more money. As a result, employers will have to make cuts in order to accommodate this new expense, cuts that will come in the form of lost jobs, Speaker. Once again, why is the Dalton McGuinty government increasing costs and regulations on one of the few growing industries in this province? It just doesn't make any sense and shows a government that is, again, limping from one problem to the next.

This government has stopped listening to real private sector job creators in this province. Is the goal to have fewer jobs and to stop economic growth? It seems that the McGuinty government thinks as much; at least, that is where they are leading us to.

Speaker, these regulations are costing Ontario workers their jobs, their livelihoods. Why is the Liberal government increasing taxes on one of the few growing industries in Ontario? We need to eliminate red tape and unnecessary regulation in order to allow the economy to grow for Ontario to prosper. The overregulation that Ontario's businesses are seeing is crippling the economy and destroying jobs. Bill 11 is another example of an expense for the government we can't afford.

I was recently contacted by a constituent who is voicing his concern about regulations and the crippling effect it was having on his business. Brian MacKenzie, who is the operations manager at McRobert Fuels, is currently frustrated and outraged with the unnecessary red tape in Ontario. Sadly, his plant's operations have been temporarily shut down, Speaker, because the Ontario government is not certifying enough engineers to perform routine safety checks at the plant—safety checks that this very government requires and has mandated.

He is also frustrated because according to industry regulations, there are several people who must perform these safety checks separately of the others. Why can't one certified individual perform these checks? Why is the current McGuinty government not ensuring that there are enough certified engineers to perform these routine checks?

Instead of blowing money on another wasteful bureaucracy, we have a company that has to shut down operations in my riding of Lambton-Kent-Middlesex. We have people who want to work. We have people in Ontario who want to be certified. Why is nothing being done to streamline regulations and eliminate red tape so that the people of Ontario can get back to work? This is an example of this government killing jobs in southwestern Ontario.

Speaker, it would seem that the McGuinty government is so completely out of touch, so out to lunch, that they

just don't get it. That's right. It's still early in the morning today but the McGuinty Liberals are already out to lunch and, of course, the people stuck paying the tab are the taxpayers in my riding of Lambton-Kent-Middlesex and taxpayers throughout the entire province of Ontario. From east to west, from north to south, people are stuck paying the tab for this government's over-spending.

The solution for Ontario's job crisis is not more spending and it isn't more regulation. It is certainly not passing Bill 11 here today. Current overregulation and government spending are crippling Ontario's economy and destroying jobs. More spending in the form of this bill will only add to the problem and compound the disaster we are currently facing.

Under Dalton McGuinty, Ontario's debt has more than doubled and will hit \$411 billion in five years, by 2017, if left unchecked, Speaker—\$411 billion. Our deficit will be a crippling \$30 billion in those same five years. If I were a Liberal on the other side of this House I would keep my head down as well because that's absolutely despicable and shameful—irresponsible.

There are no more questions. The report card is in: Dalton McGuinty and the Liberal government have a spending problem and for some reason, the Liberals keep telling us that continuing to spend more money will improve jobs and improve the economy. Why don't they understand? Did they not read any of Don Drummond's report, the very report that they bought and paid for with our tax dollars? Here's what Drummond said. He said that instead of things getting better through government stimulus programs, the debt has doubled and Ontario's jobs crisis keeps getting worse.

Dalton McGuinty's spending plan is not working. But don't fear, Speaker: The Ontario PC Party, the Ontario PC caucus and our leader have a plan for economic growth and job creation. The best part about our plan is that it doesn't come with a billion-dollar price tag. This is in comparison to Dalton McGuinty's approach, the approach we are seeing in Bill 11.

It will not be easy but it is realistic. It is no secret that the global economy remains fragile and the road to economic growth will be challenging in the current economic climate—no secret, Speaker. The debt crisis in Europe and the economic competition from low-cost jurisdictions continue to impact on our economy, but we are forgetting some minor details with all of this. The rising deficit and the doubling of Ontario's debt started long before the global economic crisis. It's worth repeating, but we sometimes forget that this crisis of Dalton McGuinty's that we're seeing in Ontario started long before the global economic crisis. The recession hit everyone, but Dalton McGuinty simply has been pursuing the wrong economic policies here in Ontario. The only person who should be blamed for Ontario's economic situation is Dalton McGuinty. It's time that the Premier takes responsibility for his spending and changes his approach. Government spending cannot be what drives the economy, and that is why corporate welfare

and corporate bailouts like Bill 11 are unnecessary and unproductive.

**0930**

As a small business person and someone who employs over 65 people at our family business, I can tell you that local businesses are suffering and are being left with no choice but to leave Ontario due to the economic climate that has been created here, the climate that this government has created. I've been speaking to many business owners and many entrepreneurs since taking on the role of economic development and innovation critic for our party. Not one single owner has told me that they want welfare and subsidies from government—not one. No one is looking for a handout in Ontario. But you see, under the Dalton McGuinty government, we have seen skyrocketing energy rates, increased red tape and government bureaucracy and an ineffective and antique apprenticeship system. This is why we have a jobs crisis in the province of Ontario.

Under Dalton McGuinty, hydro rates increased eight times since 2003, by a total of 84%, or a whopping 150% for families with smart meters. Despite promising Ontario families that his expensive energy experiments and Green Energy Act would only raise rates by 1%, Dalton McGuinty now admits that hydro bills will rise 46% by 2015. Even the Ontario Energy Board acknowledged Dalton McGuinty's energy experiments were behind the latest hydro increase when they said that new forms of power generation as a result of the Green Energy Act are costing more to produce. Instead of Bill 11, focus on concerns real businesses are faced with.

In my riding of Lambton-Kent-Middlesex—and this is scary, Speaker—there is a retailer who has a local grocery store that is located in a small town where thousands of manufacturing jobs have been lost since 2003. He has a monthly hydro bill of between \$18,000 and \$20,000 a month. His bill used to be less than half of that a short time period ago.

Speaker, how are small businesses supposed to survive in Dalton McGuinty's Ontario? The increase in hydro rates is unacceptable and is crippling Ontario's economy. You and I know that the price of hydro is an economic essential that can help drive the economy forward. I believe policies should be focused on creating an efficient supply of power at affordable prices. Ontario's economic policy has to have a plan for economic development, and the current structure certainly needs to change.

Speaker, the system isn't working. The Auditor General, Moody's investment services, the Conference Board of Canada, the people of Ontario, the official opposition here at Queen's Park and now Don Drummond have all said so, but the Premier refuses to listen and refuses to budge. Competition must be established; this will ensure that there are lower prices and efficient technology. Regulation must be stable. If prices are competitive and regulations are stable, Ontario will attract investment to the province. If there is not competition and prices continue to skyrocket as they have for so long under this

Premier, then we will do nothing more than drive investment out of Ontario.

The current approach to energy is not realistic, nor is it sustainable. The feed-in tariff program is barely two years old, yet the OPA has already been flooded with 10,000 FIT applications and 44,000 microFIT applications—nearly 55,000 applications in two years. We are seeing the hype mount around these energy programs; however, they are not sustainable. The buzz will die down and the bubble will burst. Other provinces and jurisdictions already know this. They understand this concept and they apply it to their policies, for example, in Alberta, where they have successfully used a competitive process. Our friends just over the border, in the southern United States and Texas and much of the Midwestern US, are finding renewable power can't compete in the open market on its own merit. Fifty US states and nine other provinces procure renewable energy using the principles of competition; only in Ontario do we pay developers a flat subsidy.

According to the Ministry of Energy, electricity prices in this province will double over the next 20 years, while the US energy information agency actually projects electricity prices in the US will decrease over the same time period. If you were an entrepreneur looking to start a business, where would you choose? Probably just like EMD in London did, you would choose to locate south of the border, away from the Dalton McGuinty government and his policies, which are failed, non-friendly business policies.

Every jurisdiction we're competing with for jobs and investment is after the same thing: a reliable and diversified supply of power at the lowest cost, Speaker. Currently, Ontario doesn't have this. Under the current structure we are seeing businesses leave Ontario and relocate to a more affordable location. The skyrocketing hydro rates in Ontario are driving business out of Ontario for good. If the government continues on its current path, London Economics International estimates Ontario will have the absolute highest electricity prices in all of Canada by 2015. These electricity prices will be combined with the absolute highest regulatory burden in all of this country, matched by the worst government spending and debt problem in all of Canada, a triple threat working against our recovery.

Speaker, hydro costs are skyrocketing, the people of Ontario can no longer afford to live in Ontario and businesses cannot afford to operate in Ontario. We are losing business every day because the cost of operating is just way too high. This is Dalton McGuinty's legacy as Premier of Ontario: 600,000 and counting unemployed and a staggering debt of \$411 billion if change doesn't happen.

Here in Ontario, we require good home heating at a fair and reasonable price. In order to restore Ontario as an economic leader and to repair the economy, hydro rates must change. Once we have re-established this level playing field, then the best way to attract new investment is with a stable regulatory environment where everyone

knows the rules of the game and they only change in predictable ways. Overregulation must be eliminated and the economy allowed to operate through a free enterprise system. Speaker, my friends across the aisle need to support free enterprise in Ontario.

It is unfair that the rules of the game are constantly changing, and because Ontario lacks stability, business owners are not willing to operate here and are leaving one by one. I see this every day, not just in my riding of Lambton-Kent-Middlesex but across southwestern Ontario. Corporate taxes are an example. The Liberals are not reducing corporate taxes one day; then they are reducing them. Now, apparently, they've flipped their position and they're not going to reduce corporate taxes.

The approaches taken by the current government signal that Dalton McGuinty has no long-term vision or plan to get there. It sends the wrong message to investors and developers, small businesses and families alike. The result is that the cost of operation in Ontario is simply unaffordable. It's not the role of the government to micromanage any sector of the economy, nor pick winners or losers like they're trying to do in Bill 11. The current government is micromanaging the economy, over and over again, from the Premier's seat right here in Toronto. Nothing says "out of touch" more than a Premier making decisions from downtown Toronto. Instead, it's the role of the government to create the right conditions for investment and job creation and then to stay out of business affairs.

The Premier of Ontario needs to change the current conditions and help better the economy in Ontario. Ontario must be favourable for businesses to perform. It's about time that the McGuinty government addresses the current economic climate and makes the necessary changes to help repair Ontario's economy for good. This government is so focused on the here and now that it has failed to establish a long-term plan that will make Ontario's economy a leader again.

**0940**

We face a growing deficit that is double the size of all the other Canadian provinces combined, and has been for four years now. Even through our darkest days, Ontario's tremendous potential has always been there. It's not too late to take a different path, to restore Ontario as an economic leader in this great nation of Canada. That means creating the right conditions for new growth, new investment and new jobs.

But here we are today continuing down the same path as before, blindly throwing money at problems in the hopes that some of it sticks, but this very approach is how we've ended up in the situation we are now in with hundreds of thousands of Ontarians out of work.

Government spending is up 80% since the McGuinty Liberals came to office. Bill 11, again, is more of the same. It's really very simple: The government has a spending problem, and spending more money when you're in debt is a bad decision. It's the wrong decision, and certainly it's not going to help Ontario families get back to work. I learned this in our family business from a

young age. You can only spend more than you make for so long. Dalton McGuinty obviously didn't get the same education.

The Ontario PC Party, our leader, Tim Hudak, and our caucus believe that the current apprenticeship system needs to change. The system is completely out of date and not creating the jobs that Ontarians need.

The Ministry of Finance predicts there will be over one million skilled jobs vacancies by 2021. Despite Ontario's jobs crisis, we have a major skilled labour shortage. Modernizing Ontario's apprenticeship system would help create 200,000 skilled trades jobs over the next four years—sound economic policy. Allowing employers to take on more apprentices and giving more responsibility to colleges to match apprentices up with employers will help more young people find skilled trades jobs.

The PC Party would lower the apprenticeship ratio to one to one, while delegating more responsibility to Ontario's colleges for matching apprentices up with employers. The result would be, again, 200,000 new skilled trades jobs, from sheet metal workers to plumbers to electricians. Again, this is real, common sense, private sector job creation. I don't understand why the government just doesn't listen to the members opposite.

People want to work in the skilled trades, but this government, once again, is preventing job growth and economic growth from happening—shameful. In one simple, practical step we can give 200,000 men and women the opportunity to build a good career in the skilled trades right here in the province of Ontario. Imagine the positive impact that this will have on new home construction, on infrastructure maintenance and on industrial output. Imagine the jobs there, if we want them to be.

In most provinces around this great country, employers are allowed to hire one apprentice for every journeyman employed. In Ontario, some trades require as many as five journeymen to hire one apprentice, limiting the number of young people who can find work. The Canadian Federation of Independent Business has said that "The sole limiting factor in our ability to train more apprentices is the journeyman/apprentice ratio requirements" in Ontario.

Ontario faces a big and growing jobs-training deficit, producing 46% fewer tradespeople per capita than the rest of the country. Because of Dalton McGuinty's dismal record on creating apprenticeship positions, only one in four Ontario apprentices finishes their job training. Ontario will face up to one million skilled jobs vacancies by 2021 without urgent action to reform an antiquated apprenticeship system. There are jobs that can be created with little to no cost. Why does the government think that the only way to solve problems is to spend more money, like in Bill 11?

Ontario is lagging behind the rest of the world as well. In the 1990s Australia reformed its training system, and the number of apprentices doubled between 1995 and 2000. The United Kingdom, France and Sweden have also increased their number of apprenticeship positions

through similar reforms. This is a method that's tried and true, has worked around the world, Speaker, and is something that this government should consider. This is an opportunity for the Dalton McGuinty government, and they are doing nothing to take advantage of it. Enough is enough. It is time that the spending stops and the current structures that are in place are changed.

Our apprenticeship plan is a real jobs plan; Bill 11 is not.

I hear, time and time again, from my constituents in Lambton-Kent-Middlesex that they don't want a government that picks winners and losers, that pits rural versus urban, that favours one region over another or one industry over another. Most importantly, they want a change in direction, new thinking and new ideas coming from their government. But Dalton McGuinty and his government just don't get it.

It's not just members of the opposition saying this, Speaker. A report in the *Ottawa Citizen* on November 15—the recent Roger Martin report—has asked that the government abandon "its policy of picking 'winners and losers' ... through subsidies to businesses." This is a respected dean from the Rotman School of Management saying this.

Another interesting fact comes from a study done by the Fraser Institute—and this is staggering, Speaker—that uncovers that the Ontario government has spent a total of \$27.7 billion on corporate welfare. This money has been spent based on the promise that the economic state in Ontario will get better, and we all know that the state of the economy in Ontario is actually getting worse: 600,000 people unemployed, 600,000 men and women unemployed in Ontario; small businesses closing along Main Streets across the province; factories closing across this great province.

It has been proven over and over again that McGuinty's spending legacy is not working. It has proven itself to be a complete and utter failure. The people of Ontario may sit back and ask, "How did this happen? How did the economic state of Ontario get so bad?" You see, Speaker, here in Ontario, revenue is up \$35 billion under the Liberals, but spending is up \$45 billion. This year alone, we are spending \$2 million more each hour than we are taking in through revenue. It doesn't take a math genius to understand that if revenue is up \$35 billion but spending is up \$45 billion, there's going to be a shortfall sooner or later.

This is shameful, despicable and an insult to future generations in this province, that this government doesn't have a spine to act. It's just shameful that this government does not have a spine to act. They had to see it coming for many years; everyone was telling them. But again, this government, in my opinion, Speaker, is completely gutless.

The single biggest cost driver on the spending side is public sector compensation and the total expansion of government. This is not what we stand for, and this is not affordable. It never was affordable, Speaker. That is why we have called for a public sector wage freeze,

something that will save Ontario families over \$2 billion in the next two years alone.

While a public sector wage freeze won't turn our entire province around, it does signal that things are changing in this province and that we will not continue down our current path. It also sends an important message to job creators inside and outside the province that we're getting our fiscal house in order.

You see, what is affordable for Ontario families is creating an attractive environment to run a business, a place where costs are predictable and where small businesses and entrepreneurs can come and grow their businesses. I believe in a system of free enterprise, a system where people and businesses create jobs. Speaker, I'm proud to say I'm a capitalist.

In Ontario, our revenue is at an all-time high, but it is uncontrolled spending on things like public sector compensation that is a problem. The current government has not posed a single new idea for reining in spending. Premier McGuinty really only knows how to do one thing, and that is to spend.

Speaker, while the people of Ontario want to have a consistent and predictable partner in the Ontario government, the Premier's ideas have proven, time and time again, to get us deeper and deeper into debt. Again, a staggering \$411 billion is staring at us as we come back to work today in the Legislature.

**0950**

The reckless spending and inability to define priorities are at the root of the crisis that we face today, and the Premier has no idea what to do. So Premier McGuinty just keeps on spending, hoping that something will work, that something will stick, that something might actually change. But we can't go on hope anymore, Speaker. We can't depend on much these days, but the only thing that we can depend on, if given the chance under Dalton McGuinty, is that spending will increase, the deficit is going to increase, jobs will continue to leave the province, and the people of Ontario will continue to suffer with higher and higher taxes and skyrocketing debt levels.

It's going to take courage, and I urge the Premier to show some courage and some leadership in this position. He hasn't shown it since 2003, and it's time that we see some change.

Our position is quite clear. We can't support any additional spending without significant savings elsewhere. We can't continue writing cheques that we can't cash. We can't buy things that we can't afford. Families in Ontario understand this; small businesses across my riding, across southwestern Ontario, across the entire province understand this; and certainly our leader, Tim Hudak, our PC Party, our PC caucus and our members of the official opposition clearly understand that. We've been demonstrating that since the election on October 6.

To be clear, it's not the government's job to pick winners and losers amongst privately owned companies. Ontario families simply can't afford these subsidies and corporate handouts any longer. Bill 11 is not smart legislation, Speaker.

A week ago, Don Drummond reported that Ontario is going to be faced with a \$411-billion debt, and here we are, first thing back to the Legislature, and the government is calling a spend bill to spend \$160 million—again, just completely out of touch with what's happening. They're obviously not leaving this building, and they're not leaving Toronto, and they're not talking to businesses and families across the province.

Don Drummond knows it, we know it, and it really seems that the only people who don't understand this are the members of the current Liberal government: Red tape and increased government spending are not helping our economy. Instead, we are seeing the debt rise daily. The economy is getting worse and worse because the government is still spending. The McGuinty government has a spending problem, but now that the money has run out, it is time for the spending to stop.

Speaker, as you will know, myself and our leader and our caucus strongly oppose corporate welfare. We strongly oppose government slush funds, such as the one being proposed in Bill 11, and we strongly believe that now is the time to reduce spending, not increase spending. As I have stated here today and as we have stated since the election, we simply cannot support additional spending without significant cutbacks in other areas.

Speaker, we have two crises in the province of Ontario. We have a jobs crisis: 600,000 men and women unemployed. We have a debt crisis: We're going to be approaching \$411 billion by 2017. It's staring us in the face here this morning. Bill 11 will not help in either of these areas.

Again, I just think that the government's actions are despicable. They need courage, they need conviction to make change. I just hope that they look across the aisle to the official opposition; look to our good ideas to get government spending under control. Speaker, if they won't do it, our leader, Tim Hudak, and our party certainly will.

I just urge the government and I urge all members in this House not to support Bill 11. It's more spending that we can't afford: \$160 million proposed.

I go back to my point earlier: I met with hundreds of businesses—and I come from a small business background. Businesses don't want handouts. So for this government to propose a bill that calls for spending and corporate handouts is just completely out of touch. What businesses want are affordable hydro rates and less government red tape. We have 500,000 regulations on the books in the province of Ontario, and the Canadian Federation of Independent Business says that these regulations are costing businesses \$11 billion per year. Think of how many jobs the province's businesses would create if the government allowed job creators to create jobs.

In Dalton McGuinty's Ontario it's tough to do business today. I know; I'm speaking with these business owners. The entrepreneurial spirit is moving elsewhere. It's dead in a lot of areas in this province. Costs are too high; people aren't willing to take a chance in Ontario to start a business, to hire people. We need to restore their

faith and their hope in the province so that they'll start a business, employ people and turn the ship around in Ontario.

As I've mentioned a few times, coming from a small-business background—my brother and I proudly took over from my father a few years ago. This is a family business that my father took over from his father. It started in 1948. I fear that the approach Dalton McGuinty is taking is forcing small businesses to close shop and family businesses to close shop. I have a lot of businesses in my riding that have been in business for 50, 60 and even 100 years, and with the direction this government is taking the province, I'm scared for the future of a lot of businesses in my riding in southwestern Ontario.

I will be proudly voting against Bill 11 and against the ever-expanding McGuinty pork train. I encourage my colleagues here today to join me in opposing continued government expansion and to also vote against Bill 11.

I have a copy of this report from the Fraser Institute that clearly shows the Ontario government has spent almost \$30 billion on corporate welfare—absolutely shameful. Over the past number of years, Ontario's government spent almost \$30 billion on direct subsidies to corporations. "In 2008-09 alone, the bill for corporate welfare amounted to almost" \$3 billion. "For anyone"—this is staggering—"who paid income tax in 2008, the cost of corporate welfare was \$424 per Ontarian (or \$848 per dual-income couple)." This is the McGuinty approach: Spend and unemployment goes up.

"By lowering taxes rates for all and offering subsidies to none, Ontario's government could concentrate its spending and tax policy where it would do the most good."

"Ontario's corporate welfare has an opportunity cost. The province's corporate welfare expenditures could have been redirected (in the current fiscal year) to one of the following..." This is interesting but the Fraser Institute—this is from their report—is saying this is where that money could have gone. The \$3 billion given in 2008-09 could have eliminated Ontario's health premium. It could have eliminated the top personal income tax surtax of 36% and reduced the lower surtax from 20% to 10%. It could further reduce the corporate income tax rate to 8% in 2011 or 2012, or it could reduce Ontario's annual deficit by \$2.7 billion a year.

Governments have spent in Ontario over the last number of years almost \$30 billion in corporate welfare. Clearly, it would have benefited families more going elsewhere. Again, the pork barrelling, the pork train has to end here in Ontario.

To conclude, I just want to ask all MPPs on both sides of this House to stand with me, stand with our party, stand with our leader, and vote against Bill 11. Let's stand on the side of small businesses, family businesses and job creators, Speaker. Let's free job creators to create jobs in the province. Let's get these 600,000 people back to work in the province. And let's hope that between now and the next few days Dalton McGuinty grows a spine and gets the jobs crisis under control and gets the

spending crisis under control, or the province of Ontario is going to be broke. I'll tell you, on our watch on this side of the House we will not let Ontario become the next Greece or Spain. We're stronger than that. We're putting forward positive ideas to restore Ontario to being the best place to live, to work and to start a business.

Speaker, thank you very much.

1000

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Speaker, a Conservative talking about corporate welfare? I can hardly believe my ears. Man, oh, man, oh, man, what is this world coming to? It's topsy-turvy around here.

But corporate welfare—well, you know, there's a thing called corporate tax cuts that the Conservatives and Liberals are very happy about and keep on doling out and out without any kind of conditions, without any kind of strings attached, and somehow or other that's not considered corporate welfare? Listen, I wasn't going to say anything but I will say that about that.

On this particular bill, I listened to the presentation of the member, and I guess I have a bit of a different opinion in the sense that economic development funds can be quite useful. I come from a part of the province, northern Ontario, where we have the northern heritage fund. The minister who sits across the way would know, as the chair of the fund, it is a very successful fund that has been chaired by members of the Conservative caucus when they were in government and chaired by our people when we were in government, and now by the Liberals, that has done a lot of good work when it comes to economic development in regions of the province that sometimes need help.

The problem for a lot of businesses is they can't access capital. So what do you do when you're trying to access capital to get something up and running so that you can invest in an enterprise of some type that you want to make a return on and at the same time create some jobs?

Is this particular fund set up the way that I would like to see it? Absolutely not. I think we should follow the model of the heritage fund. There should be an actual board. There should be a process by which we determine what type of loans can be put forward with loan guarantees—and sometimes it's a combination of loan and loan guarantees—so that we can actually do some economic development in those parts of the province that are having problems trying to do the kind of economic development that needs to be done.

It will be interesting when this bill goes to committee, because I'm sure that's one of the areas that our members are going to be very interested to talk about.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Mrs. Liz Sandals:** I'd like to respond to the comments by the member from Lambton-Kent-Middlesex concerning Bill 11. Unlike him, I will be supporting Bill

11 and the creation of the southwestern Ontario development fund.

But I think it's really interesting to look at what happened when there was a consultation in Guelph by the Minister of Economic Development on the terms of the southwestern Ontario development fund, its structure. Just as the member from Timmins—James Bay suggested, we need to look at how we set this fund up, because we've got the northern heritage fund and the eastern Ontario development fund, and we need to sort it out.

I expected that we would have people from Guelph come to Guelph, and we did. I expected that we would have people from Waterloo region come; they did. There were people there from the member for Kitchener—Waterloo's riding who are associated with the University of Waterloo and who were very interested in the economic development possibilities around technology. There were people there from the riding of the member for Wellington—Halton Hills, people from both Wellington and Halton, who wanted to know if Halton could be included in the fund.

But I was quite surprised by some of the other places that people came from because they wanted to be included in the fund. There were people there from the riding of Simcoe—Grey. There were people from the riding of York—Simcoe. There were people from the riding of Huron—Bruce. There were people from as far away as Parry Sound—Muskoka who wanted to be included in this. There were people from Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound. There were people from Perth—Wellington.

The fact is that the people in southwestern Ontario drove to Guelph to say, "We want this fund."

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments and questions?

**Mr. Steve Clark:** I want to thank the member for Lambton—Kent—Middlesex for his speech on Bill 11.

I want to talk about the eastern Ontario development fund in the two minutes that I have. First, you really can't talk about that fund without recognizing Bob Runciman or Norm Sterling, two champions of eastern Ontario economic development.

But I have to tell you there was a story in the Ottawa Citizen during the election talking about the fact that more money was going into Liberal ridings than in Conservative ridings. In fact, they couldn't even come to grips with how much money was left in the fund. The report from the—and I want to thank Lee Greenburg for the report. Some said \$50 million, \$49.4 million, \$48.2 million; some said \$40 million.

I have to admit that after the election—it was actually my birthday—I wrote the minister on November 7 and asked for a meeting. I have to be honest: I was worried that that \$40 million that was left in that fund was going to be taken, cut in half, \$20 million was going to go to the southwest and \$20 million was going to go to the east. So I asked—a very simple request, a very modest request—to have a meeting with all of the eastern Ontario MPPs to talk about the fund, to talk about accountability measures that should be in the fund, to talk about

suggestions that the eastern Ontario wardens talked about for this fund. Nothing. I had to continue to ask the minister and finally, after long last, we shamed him into having a meeting on Thursday.

But I have to tell you, there's lots of confusion. The eastern Ontario wardens think there's money left in the fund. The Ottawa Citizen story would lead you to believe there was money left in the fund. Jean-Marc Lalonde, the architect of the fund, the former member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, when he came to my riding on June 24 admitted there was \$31 million left in the fund. However, Minister Duguid and members of his staff now say there's no money left in the fund. There should be \$25 million if you listened to the Attorney General last month at the Eastern Ontario Wardens' Caucus.

So the wardens think there's money left, the councils think there's money left, economic developers think there's money left. So, mister, you'd better tell us on Thursday where's our—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments and questions?

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** We've heard it loud and clear throughout Ontario that people are concerned about jobs and are concerned about job creation. So if this eastern/southwestern fund will encourage job creation, if it'll invigorate the economy, then we welcome it. But let's be very clear: We need to have some transparency, we need to have accountability, we need to guarantee that the funds will directly result in jobs being created. There has to be a strong, strings-attached policy. This can't be blank cheques given to corporations. We don't want another Electro-Motive happening in Ontario. We don't want another corporation that gets \$5 million of taxpayer dollars to up and leave because they see a cheaper deal somewhere else.

We want to ensure that there are good jobs, that there are permanent jobs here in Ontario, and if this fund will have the stringent controls in place, the accountability in place, transparency in place, then that's something we can look at, but without that, that's completely unacceptable. We don't want to be giving away our taxpayer dollars to corporations who don't guarantee jobs in this province, who ship out jobs overseas, who ship out jobs down south. That's not acceptable. That's not the Ontario that we want to live in. We want to protect our citizens, protect our community, ensure that there are jobs here for everyone.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for Lambton—Kent—Middlesex has two minutes to respond.

**Mr. Monte McNaughton:** Well, thank you, Speaker, and I will keep this to two minutes or under.

I'd like to thank the MPPs who spoke to my remarks: the members from Timmins—James Bay, Guelph, Leeds—Grenville and Bramalea—Gore—Malton.

But before I get into my closing remarks, I can clearly see where this session is going. It appears—just when it comes to Bill 11—that this is going to be a session where the Dalton McGuinty Liberal Democrats join together.

So we're seeing the NDP working with the Liberals and we can see they have the same philosophy.

We've been clear, Speaker. The Liberals just don't get it. Here we are the first day, day one back after being away from here for months, and the Liberals want to spend \$160 million, and the number \$411 billion is staring at us. I mean, it's shameful. Each year, we're spending billions of dollars more on interest payments. It's just despicable. We have a debt crisis in the province; by 2017 it's going to put us in the league of Greece and Portugal. And of course, we have a jobs crisis. Bill 11 will not do anything to help the 600,000 men and women without work.

Our party has a clear plan. Let's reform the apprenticeship system, let's get hydro rates under control, and let's slash the government regulations and red tape that are not allowing private sector growth in the province of Ontario.

Again, Speaker, I thank you for the time, and I hope everyone will support our party in this initiative.

*Second reading debate deemed adjourned.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** It being close to 10:15 of the clock, this House stands recessed until 10:30.

*The House recessed from 1011 to 1030.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Okay. It is time for us to get back to work in the House. I do want to welcome everyone back, including all of our guests, but I also want to say to the members here, thank you for the work that you've done in your constituency offices during this time when the House isn't sitting. To make sure everyone understands, you are a very hard-working group of people on behalf of the citizens of Ontario, and I thank you so much for doing that.

Now I would like to offer you time for introduction of guests.

**Ms. Sylvia Jones:** Please help me in introducing a councillor from the town of Orangeville and the proud parent of page Patrick, Jeremy Williams.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** I am actually making this introduction on behalf of the member for Simcoe North as well, because we share an interest in these constituents: Janet MacDougall, who is actually the executive director of Yes I Can! Nursery School in my riding, Marnie MacDougall, Janet's daughter, and Michael Hawkins, Janet's son-in-law. Welcome.

**Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** Joining us today in the east members' gallery, I'd like to welcome Oakville residents Richard and Pat Gorwall. They're here to see their granddaughter Katie on her first day as a page.

**Hon. Margaret R. Best:** Good morning. I would like to take this opportunity to welcome Anne Newman and Victor Newman to the Ontario Legislature today. They are the grandparents of page James Newman from Scarborough-Guildwood.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** I would like to welcome in the members' east gallery Mr. Chris Watson, here from the Canadian Union of Public Employees.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further introductions? There being none, it's now time for oral questions.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Excuse me. Just in time. The member from Carleton-Mississippi Mills.

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** Thank you, Speaker. I'd like to introduce Colleen Hochgeschurz from my riding of Carleton-Mississippi Mills. She's here today to see her daughter Katelyn Hochgeschurz, who is on her first day as a page.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Now I will call upon the leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition for question period.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### PUBLIC SERVICES

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Premier, today the Legislature is returning after a considerable break in the shadow of another eHealth-style spending scandal at Ornge, the air ambulance service, and we also are returning with the government seemingly paralyzed in the face of a growing debt crisis in the province of Ontario.

The Drummond report, which is supposed to be your silver bullet to address all the spending problems, was released last week, but you've not indicated a single measure that you will implement. Premier, of the entire 700 pages, which recommendations will you actually implement?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** I thank my honourable colleague for the question. I want to take the opportunity as well to thank Don Drummond and the other commissioners for the very important work that they've done.

Speaker, as you know, this report flows from a directive we put in last year's budget. We anticipated the need for some profound changes, not only in terms of individual programs but also in terms of how government goes about its work. I think it's very important that, in the coming days and weeks, we understand that we can and should engage in the best way for us to balance that budget, but we cannot debate—I certainly am not prepared to debate—our shared objective, which is surely to ensure that we balance the budget by 2017-18, ensure that government is more affordable and that we improve the quality of services. I believe that we can in fact achieve that destination by working together.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary question?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Premier, here's the concern that the Ontario PCs have and that Ontario taxpayers have: We're worried about this troubling paralysis on the government

side when it comes to addressing the growing debt crisis in Ontario. Let me tell you why I say that.

The deficit is actually up, not down. While you say you're going to control spending, spending has actually gone up in every government ministry except two since last year, and since the election, you've announced an additional \$2.5 billion in expenditures and no savings to match them. Premier, we're worried that you actually haven't learned the lesson from the last election, which indicated that we need to get spending under control.

Let me ask you this: You've had the Drummond report for some time, I believe. You've been briefed all along. When will we actually see your plan to balance the books and get spending under control in the province of Ontario?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, I want to speak to the issue that is raised by my honourable colleague about spending. I think it's important to reference the Drummond report. I'll quote from a specific passage, where the commission says:

"Spending is neither out of control nor wildly excessive. Ontario runs one of the lowest-cost provincial governments in Canada relative to its GDP and has done so for decades." He goes on to say, "And we must recognize that some important steps have been taken in the past few years to help manage costs, improve our prospects for future economic growth and enhance services to the public."

I say to my honourable colleague and to all members of the opposition that our shared responsibility now is to debate the best way for us to move forward together. Any responsible advice that my colleague would care to offer in that regard would be gratefully received.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Again, Speaker, a very troubling response by the Premier. The Drummond report gives 362 failing grades to the Liberal government; 362 ways to reduce spending. He says that if we don't act today, we'll face a \$30-billion deficit, not a balanced budget, as you promised, in 2017, and you're en route to almost tripling the debt—and the Premier pats himself on the back for controlling spending? Just how out of touch is that response, Premier?

Let me ask you again, because I'm troubled by your response that says you're doing a good job when the report says the opposite: Can you tell me one thing from the Drummond report—just one thing, Premier—that you actually will implement?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Again, we're very pleased with the work done by the Drummond commission. I think it is exceptionally thorough. I think it's the most thorough set of recommendations of its kind, I would venture to say, in the history of our country.

I've made it clear, Speaker, that while the commission's responsibility is to provide us with advice, our job in government is, of course, to make the final decisions. We will incorporate the recommendations made by the Drummond commission in our budget, but before that

point in time, of course, we're looking to the advice of our honourable colleagues opposite in opposition. We look forward to hearing from Ontarians. The Minister of Finance will consider his pre-budget consultations, and we hope that there will be a legislative committee that will take a closer look, as well, at the Drummond commission. All those opportunities will, I'm sure, provide us with even better advice with respect to the best way to move forward, and we look forward to doing that.

## PUBLIC SERVICES

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Back to the Premier: Premier, you describe the Drummond report as "thorough." I won't argue with that. But your response is anything but thorough. Your response has been vacuous to date. There has been an absence of leadership, despite the fact that I believe you've had the Drummond report on your desk probably for five or six weeks. The report was made public yesterday.

Let me tell you the problem: Every hour of every day, we're spending \$1.8 million more than we have in revenue. So, to date, since the Drummond report has come out, Speaker, we're up another \$250 million in debt, because there has been no action.

1040

Premier, waiting until the end of March is not good enough. We're in a big hole. The first rule when you're in a hole is you stop digging. Premier, will you bring the budget forward? Will you act sooner, or do we have to actually wait—are you telling us—until the end of March for you to shake off your paralysis in ending your runaway spending?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, I appreciate my honourable colleague's impatience, but I'm not going to be providing a list of which of the 362 we support and which we don't.

But I would appreciate hearing from the opposition, Speaker, to provide us with important advice that will help shape our budget, as to which of the recommendations they support and which of the recommendations they don't support. Our responsibility at this point in time is to continue to listen, to get a reaction to this report from both the opposition and from Ontarians themselves, and to incorporate that information and that advice into our budget. We're on track to doing that, and we'll continue to do that.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Premier, with all due respect, people want to see leadership; they want to see action. Crunch time has come, and they expect something more than the Premier once again punting this down the road. We've waited practically a year since you appointed Mr. Drummond. You've had the report for six weeks.

Let me ask the Premier this. You've told us what you're not going to do on his recommendation: You said you're going to go full steam with full-day kindergarten at a cost of \$1.5 billion a year. Mr. Drummond says that if you take something out of his equation, you have to put

something back on the table. So I ask you, Premier, if you're going to add \$1.5 billion on to the tab, what else will you put on the table? Where will you find the savings to make up for that additional \$1.5 billion?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, full-day kindergarten is not a matter of political convenience for us on this side of the House; it's a matter of conviction. I draw an important distinction between convenience and conviction.

We will find a way. This is a good example of the value set that we are bringing to the choices before us. One of the things that the Drummond commission reinforces over and over again is that it's important to establish as a priority those things that invest in the future. There are all kinds of stakeholders for the present but not so many when it comes to representing the future. That's our responsibility here, so we are absolutely wed to full-day kindergarten and the plan as originally put forward.

We will find other ways, Speaker—and we look forward to hearing from the opposition in this regard as well—to find savings to allow for that. But, again, it's all about making choices, choices informed by our values.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Premier, what's also troubling is that within 24 hours of the Drummond report, DBRS, the bond rating agency, put out a warning calling for action. They're worried about the lack of resolve. They say, "The strategy fleshed out to date continues to lack details," and at best your results have been mixed. This is dangerous, because the higher our bond rating, the more expensive debt becomes in the province, taking money away from health and education.

Premier, you've added on \$1.5 billion to the equation from full-day kindergarten, and you've announced \$2.5 billion in new initiatives. Let me ask you this. Your tax credit for tuition for college and university is an additional \$500 million or so. Is that off the table as well, or will you consider getting rid of that program to meet Mr. Drummond's recommendations?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, it's no secret my honourable colleague wants to increase tuition in Ontario, and we look forward to considering the plan in a full way through the budget.

But we have done a few things, and I would be interested in getting the response of our opposition to this. The Minister of Finance has announced that we're going to be selling LCBO prime real estate in downtown Toronto because that's not a good investment of public dollars, we are going to be enhancing privatization over at ServiceOntario, and we are going to seriously consider ending our subsidies for the horse racing industry.

I know we've heard from some in the opposition who are adamantly opposed to some of those provisions, but those are things that we think are important for us to consider. Again, if we're going to establish as a priority health care and education, those are the kinds of choices

we have to make, and I would love to hear where the opposition stands on those kinds of choices.

## ONTARIO ECONOMY

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My question is to the Premier. During last fall's election campaign, the Premier insisted that his no-strings-attached corporate tax giveaways wouldn't be breaking the bank; now he claims that Ontario is struggling to make ends meet. The Premier insisted he had a jobs plan, but Ontario families watched as bad strategy led to good jobs being lost in communities across the province, most recently in London; brutal layoffs all the way around. My question is a simple one: Does the Premier actually think his plan is working?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Again, Speaker, I welcome the question from my honourable colleague. It's good for us to be back and to be debating a very important issue at a very important time of consequence to the future of our province.

One of the things that I would recommend to my honourable colleague is, again, if she takes a look at the Drummond commission and the report itself, it specifically commends our government and, I think, Ontarians more generally, for the important work we have done, for example, to ensure that we have a competitive tax environment. We have done a great deal working together, reducing both personal income taxes, corporate taxes, eliminating capital taxes and helping small businesses as well. He also specifically commends the work Ontarians have done to ensure that we now have one of the most competitive workforces anywhere in the world.

Those are two important parts of the foundation for growth and prosperity that we intend to build upon.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, one thing is certainly consistent, and that is that, during the campaign and afterwards, the Premier has avoided the people who will be affected by the government's broken promises. Whether it's campaigning in a bubble or playing political games that blocked committees for months, people in this province are once again being ignored.

The Premier heard from his favourite experts. When will he actually listen to the people who end up paying those higher electricity bills, the people who end up coping with longer wait times, the people who end up having to deal with children who have larger classroom sizes and a more difficult time learning because of it—all for the purposes of paying for this Premier's corporate tax giveaways?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** It's an important time for all of us because it's an opportunity for us to give expression to the fundamental values that inform our idea of public service. As we go through these recommendations to be found within the commission's report, for example, as we hear from the opposition parties and from Ontarians generally, we're going to do everything we possibly can to: give priority to good-quality health care; the best possible schools in the world—that is our ambition in

that regard; ensure that we achieve a sustainable balance by 2017-18, one that will continue for a long time into the future; and ensure that our public services are both affordable and of a higher quality. That's the ideal that we share and that's the goal we have set for ourselves, and obviously, of course, that involves listening to people.

My honourable colleague may know that I was in London a short while ago, before we got the terrible news about Caterpillar, to meet with some of the workers there and see what it is that we might do working together.

But we're not giving up our economy. I know that my honourable colleague will give us advice in terms of how we need to respond more specifically.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** People in communities across Ontario are watching good jobs vanish. They were told that the HST and corporate tax giveaways were going to create jobs in Ontario. Instead, those people are being told that they can expect less from their government, and jobs like those at Caterpillar in London continue to walk out the door. My question again to the Premier is: Does he really believe that his plan is working, or is he willing to admit that in fact it's a failure?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Every once in a while, as I like to say, facts are helpful. Since the recession, Ontario has created over 303,000 new jobs, so we are ahead of where we used to be. Last year, we created over 121,000 new jobs in Ontario. We continue to remain the second-best place in all of North America as a recipient of foreign direct investment. We're first by far in Canada, but in North America, first it's California and then it's Ontario.

I think that one of the reasons we are there is, of course, the competitiveness of our tax environment that we have put in place. When I was in Kitchener-Waterloo just a few weeks ago and met with the folks there representing Google, who are expanding there on a second occasion, they were saying over and over again that it is the skill set of our workers that is drawing foreign direct investment to Ontario; hence, Speaker, our commitment to things like full-day kindergarten.

1050

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My second question is also to the Premier. In 2010, New Democrats raised serious concerns about the abuse of public money at Ornge. Does the Premier feel that the minister took swift and appropriate action?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** I want to begin by commending the minister for moving so decisively in terms of dealing with a very important issue of public policy and public dollars. The minister has demonstrated, I think, a real determination and conviction in dealing with these issues.

At the outset, I want to begin by acknowledging the very important work being done by the front-line workers

at Ornge, our air ambulance service. These include paramedics and pilots. Last year alone they were involved in over 19,000 patient transports, and throughout all of this upheaval in their organization they have remained absolutely committed and devoted to delivering the best possible care to Ontarians. I think it's important that together we acknowledge their unrelenting commitment to good-quality care.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Well, Speaker, commend the minister if he will, but in November 2010—over a year ago—the minister couldn't explain why Ornge was exempted from salary disclosure rules. The minister said, "We'll do the work required to get answers."

Now, over a year later, when the details of serious problems at Ornge broke in the news, we discovered that, in fact, nothing had changed, and the minister was again looking for answers. Now, I'm curious, and I'm sure the people of Ontario are curious, Speaker: What exactly happened during that last year?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Last year, as you will know, Speaker, the minister asked for a forensic audit to determine how public money was being spent. The audit uncovered financial irregularities. That information has been provided to the Ontario Provincial Police. The police are now investigating this matter and we look forward to the results of that investigation. Should the police determine that public money was in fact misspent, our government will take any and all necessary steps to recover those dollars.

In the meantime, the minister, as I say, has acted decisively. She has replaced the president; she has replaced the board of directors; she has put a stop to all for-profit activities; and she's co-operating in a full way with the province's Auditor General. I think that's exactly what's in keeping with the public interest at this point in time.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, this government set up Ornge. Well-connected Liberals were paid generously to help hammer out the details of the setting-up of Ornge. In January 2011, staff in the Premier's office met with Ornge officials and their lawyer, the former president of the Liberal Party of Canada, and they were all fully briefed—fully briefed—on the schemes at Ornge.

The Premier knew the details, Speaker. He and his minister spent a year avoiding questions, avoiding tough questions. Now do they really think, and does he really think, that anybody believes their claims of surprise today?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, I expect that in the coming days, and possibly even weeks, these kinds of allegations will be floated in and about with respect to partisan involvement in this matter. Fortunately, Speaker, there is an Auditor General who will look at this. I recall the same kinds of allegations being made at the time of eHealth, and the Auditor General spoke to that in a very decisive and finalizing type of way.

The other thing I want to say, because I know Ontarians are interested in this, is that the minister will shortly introduce legislation to strengthen our government's oversight. The new rules will include a new strict performance agreement, the strict monitoring of finances, a new patient advocate and linking executive pay to quality improvements. Again, I think that speaks to the decisive approach being brought by the Minister of Health.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** To the Minister of Health: Speaker, front-line workers at Ontario's air ambulance service have lost confidence in the Minister of Health. Paramedics, flight crews, dispatchers and support staff have watched as their once proud and efficient emergency service was turned into a playground for a handful of political friends. Millions of dollars were wasted, operational standards were compromised, and the lives of patients and crews were put at risk, all under the watch of a minister who refused opposition warnings and allowed the waste of precious health care dollars to continue, only to be forced into calling a criminal investigation.

Speaker, on behalf of those front-line health care workers, patients whose lives have been put at risk and the public who have lost confidence in this minister, I ask the minister, will she do the honourable thing? Will she accept responsibility for the scandalous mess at Ornge and resign?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you to the member opposite for the question.

What I think is important—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** There are going to be some important questions coming up, and it sounds like there's some intense emotion here. I'm going to ask—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** And if I hear one more interruption when I'm speaking, you'll be gone.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** And you.

I demand your attention.

Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you, Speaker, and thank you for the question.

I want to begin by saying thank you to the front-line workers that the member opposite has referred to. Speaker, there are 600 employees at Ornge who, every single day, come to work in order to provide the best possible care for the people they serve. I'm talking about paramedics, I'm talking about pilots, I'm talking about doctors, I'm talking about the people who maintain the aircraft.

Ornge provides a vitally important service to the people of this province, and I want to say thank you to the front-line staff who have endured difficult, difficult

weeks, because I tell you, they are doing everything they can in their—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Speaker, the minister admitted that she failed in her oversight responsibilities of Ontario's air ambulance services here at the Legislature on Friday. Forensic audits and investigations have forced the minister to order a criminal investigation. The minister admits that she was briefed on the details of the very agreement that gave carte blanche to the masterminds of the self-serving schemes of Ornge in January of last year. She did nothing to stop that. Now, rather than accept responsibility, she wants to feign ignorance. She claims that she was lied to by senior advisers and wants to now hide behind the veil of a criminal investigation.

We submit that by not stepping aside, the minister is limiting the scope of the very criminal investigation she has ordered, because we believe that the scope of that investigation should lead to her office and her staff and herself.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, the member opposite is making a very serious, outrageous and untrue allegation, and I am asking the member opposite to withdraw that allegation, because I can assure you that the Ontario Provincial Police do not take orders from me or any of my colleagues. They will do exactly the investigation that they want to do, completely unencumbered by any political direction, and if the member opposite is suggesting otherwise, I am asking him to withdraw that allegation right now.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** Ma question est pour la ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée. Il will be very brief. Can the minister tell this House when she first learned of the exorbitant executive salaries and the for-profit arrangement at Ornge, Ontario's air ambulance service?

1100

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Yes, Speaker, in fact I can, and I thank the member for the question. As you will recall, when we were last here there were questions around that issue. We were not able to get the answers from Ornge. The Auditor General was unable to get answers to the questions he was asking. My ministry officials were unable to get answers. That is why I had a meeting in my boardroom with the senior executives at Ornge and I told them—this meeting was in December—that I expected them to answer the questions that were being asked by the Auditor General and by the ministry. Only a few days later, we did receive information from Ornge on what the compensation for the senior management at Ornge was. The number—particularly for the president and CEO—was outrageous, exorbitant and completely unacceptable, which is why I sent in the forensic audit team. As we all know, that has led to an OPP investigation.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**M<sup>me</sup> France G  linas:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. From this side of the House, there seems to be a two-year delay between acting disturbed and outraged and what really happened. In estimates in 2010, the NDP asked the minister a question about the salaries and about the for-profit services at Ornge, and the minister promised that she would get back to the NDP. But she didn't. Only when these stories were on the front pages of the papers and all over the television sets did she then react. I ask again: When did you first hear about extravagant salaries at Ornge?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, the answer remains the same. It was in late December when I finally did get answers. In the meantime, the Auditor General was doing an audit of Ornge. I asked anyone who had information to submit that information either through me to the Auditor General or directly to the Auditor General. To the best of my knowledge, none of the members opposite, even though one in particular stood up with allegations—did not substantiate that. To the best of my knowledge, that information was not passed on to the Auditor General. I wanted to let the Auditor General do his job. I did not want to leap to further action. But when the Auditor General told me he was not getting answers to questions he was asking, that is when I took action. That was in December. In the meantime, we have a completely new leadership at Ornge, a new interim CEO and a new board. We are working on a new performance agreement with Ornge.

#### ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**Ms. Tracy MacCharles:** There has been a lot of talk about economic recovery and growth in Ontario, but it is unclear about how certain regions are faring. While the government has identified southwestern, eastern and northern Ontario as priority areas for strategic job investments, little is said about what's being done to create jobs in the greater Toronto area, including my riding of Pickering-Scarborough East and stretching as far as the municipalities of Clarington and Durham. My question to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade is: What is happening in employment markets in the GTA to create jobs and bring investments?

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** It's great to see the member for Pickering-Scarborough East back on her feet and it's great to see her so soon back in the game. Great to have you back.

I know that the member has been very involved promoting growth in the GTA, and Durham in particular. We've invested in 47 economic projects throughout the GTA, leveraging over \$3.5 billion in private sector investment. That has created or protected 11,300 jobs in the GTA. These projects include investments in companies like Electrovaya, Pride Pak and Magellan in Peel; General Electric, Axiom Group and Inteva in York region; ASC Signal and ProPharma in Durham; and Dana and Fifth Light Technologies in Cambridge and Oakville.

When you consider the huge economic impact of these investments and then you consider the investments we're making in places like Durham in energy and infrastructure, I have little doubt that the GTA will continue to help lead our recovery.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Tracy MacCharles:** Speaker, I thank the minister for his answer. The folks in my riding of Pickering-Scarborough East and all Ontarians are encouraged to hear the positive results that we're seeing from these investments that we've made in the GTA to create and sustain jobs. There's no doubt that the GTA is vital to the economic vitality of the Ontario economy, but it would be helpful to hear, Minister, what others are saying outside of government about our plan.

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** I'm pleased to share with the member that many experts outside of government are recognizing the progress we're making.

According to the latest CIBC Canadian Metropolitan Economic Activity Index, which was just released in January, Toronto was ranked number one for the second time in a row with the greatest economic momentum. In fact, let me quote directly from the report. It says this: "While the recession saw the city losing ground faster than the rest of the country's ... CMAs, its recovery trajectory has been much more impressive with the city's index of economic momentum currently at its highest level in more than 10 years."

Since 2009, employment in Toronto has grown 4.6%. That's well above the national average, with full-time employment accounting for the majority of that.

While there's more work to do and we're eager to get on with it, the fact is we're on the right track despite the challenges of an uncertain global economy.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** To the Minister of Health. Speaker, the minister continues to refuse to accept responsibility for the scandalous abuse of tax dollars at Ontario's air ambulance service. She claims that she either didn't know or that she was lied to. We accept neither of those excuses and neither does the public.

The fact is that the minister ignored repeated warnings from opposition members and she ignored warnings written to her by front-line employees of Ornge and stakeholders. Now, we know that the only reason this has been exposed is because of whistleblowers who are either current or former employees of Ornge. The latest: The new management installed by the minister has now told the whistleblowers to stop talking or risk going to jail. That the minister would condone that is unconscionable.

I call on the minister once again, on behalf of those front-line health care workers who want to tell the truth about what is going on there—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. I remind all members: When I stand, you sit.

Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Just to be clear, I am not resigning. I have got a lot of work to do on the transformation of our health care system. We have important work to do to make sure that our health care system meets the needs of people not just today but in the future, so I'm not going anywhere.

What I can tell you, though, is that whenever a warning was made, my ministry officials did look into those concerns.

I do want to say, though, to the member opposite, he has stood up in this House repeatedly, and elsewhere as well, saying that he has inside information, and to the best of my knowledge, he has not shared that inside information. I'm asking him today, are you going to share that information?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that any information that I have, she already has had and has done nothing with it.

I can also share with the House that I have transferred all of the information that I've received to the Auditor General. And I can also share with you that the reason the Auditor General has delayed his report is because of that additional information.

What I will say to the minister is that to threaten existing employees of Ornge with jail time if they share their concerns is unconscionable and it speaks to the fact that this government is more intent on covering up what is going on there rather than getting to the bottom of it. It's for that reason that I call on the minister to resign because she is not showing leadership. In fact, what she's doing is adding to the cover-up of something that quite frankly is—

*Interjections.*

1110

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** That exchange led me to the point where I was going to stand anyway, but the first part that was said was very on the edge. The last part was not acceptable and the member will withdraw.

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Withdraw.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, we want to thank the people who did actually bring irregularities to light. It is thanks to people who work at Ornge that we do have the information we need to take the extraordinary step of calling in the OPP, and Ornge will be implementing a whistleblower policy to further protect anyone who does share concerns that they have.

So, Speaker, what I really think it's important to do is that we let the police investigation continue. It is very important to me and to all of the people who work at Ornge that justice be done. There are serious allegations; there is a serious investigation underway. I can assure the member opposite and anyone else that my ministry is co-operating fully, that we have co-operated fully with the Auditor General, that the forensic audit team is giving everything they have collected to the criminal investigation—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

## JOB CREATION

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** To the Premier: At a time when thousands of Ontarians are in dire need of government support, the Drummond report made the dubious recommendation that Ontario should nix job creation as a priority. These are Drummond's exact words in recommendation 11-3: "Refocus the mandate of business support programs from job creation to productivity growth in the private sector."

With 600,000 Ontarians out of work, we need a job creation strategy. Will the Premier reject this recommendation or will he give up on good jobs?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, to the Minister of Economic Development and Innovation.

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the member for the question.

Like all the Drummond recommendations, we're taking a very serious look at each and every one of them. The Minister of Finance, in his budget, will be coming forward this spring with, I think, a very thorough report of those recommendations that we're going to accept. So I think the Premier was very clear on that. We will make the decisions, ultimately.

There's no question, though: Across this province we've worked very hard to put in place very strong fundamentals to build a strong economy, and Mr. Drummond is very cognizant of that. Whether it be the improvements we've made to education, whether it's been the investments we've made in infrastructure, whether it's been the energy system that we've now made very, very safe, secure and stable, whether, Mr. Speaker, it's investments we've made in innovation, all of those things are the fundamentals to build a strong economy.

But I do agree, Mr. Speaker: We want—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Speaker, I didn't hear much of an answer, except, "We will consider all these recommendations."

Look, productivity is important; we recognize that. But with 600,000 Ontarians out of work, our focus should be on creating good jobs. Without good-paying jobs, there is no prosperity: the kinds of jobs that once made this a middle-class province, the kinds of jobs that have been disappearing under the McGuinty government at an alarming rate.

Will this government make job creation a priority or is it throwing in the towel on the middle class in this province?

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** Mr. Speaker, job creation is our top priority and it always has been. That's why, in the face of very challenging global economics, we've been able to increase the number of jobs in this province last year by 121,300 net new jobs.

We have it going in the right direction, but we're not satisfied with that. We're going to keep building on those strong fundamentals that we have in this province. We're going to keep creating jobs, Mr. Speaker. We're going to keep ensuring that our private sector steps up now with those strong fundamentals and improves the productivity that we want to continue to improve on.

Mr. Drummond makes some good points in that report, Mr. Speaker. We're going to take a very close look at those recommendations, and we'll do what any responsible government will do and do what's in the best interest of the province of Ontario.

### ENERGY POLICIES

**Mrs. Liz Sandals:** My question is for the Minister of Energy.

Minister, many people take for granted the wires and poles of our electricity system. These vital components of our electricity infrastructure ensure that Ontario families, farms and small businesses have the power they need when they flip the switch. It was not too long ago that our government inherited an electricity system that was on the brink of collapse. For many years, previous governments wilfully neglected investments in our electricity system, putting reliability at risk. In fact, the Hydro One line to Guelph is 100 years old. I didn't even know they made steel lattice towers that long ago.

Over the last eight years, Ontario families have had to do the work that others failed to do. Minister, what investments have been made to restore the dirty, outdated and unreliable electricity system we inherited in 2003?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** As usual, the member from Guelph has gone to the heart of the matter: We need a reliable, clean, modern system that's fit for what families, farms and businesses actually require day to day.

So those same families, farms and businesses have been doing a lot of work the last eight years. Unfortunately, they've had to do some work that should have been done before the last eight years, and so they've spent almost three times as much money constructing 5,000 additional kilometres of new wire, redoing transformers, upgrading stations, all to make sure that when you flip the switch on, the power comes on; when you need the heat, the heat's there.

When you need to rely on it for your farm, your milking operation, your household, your business manufacturing operation, the power that you need is there when you need it, thanks to Ontario farms, families and businesses.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mrs. Liz Sandals:** I know my constituents appreciate the hard work that has been done to restore reliability in the province. As a government agency and Ontario's largest local distribution company, Hydro One plays an important role in maintaining the safety and reliability of our electricity system. The work they do keeps the lights on in our homes.

As a government, to ensure that our electricity system stays strong and vibrant in the future, we need to make the necessary investments in the grid and the necessary investments in the electrical workers of tomorrow. These young people will find employment in our clean energy economy and will be responsible for Ontario's energy future.

Minister, what is being done by Hydro One to ensure that the electrical workers of tomorrow have every opportunity to participate and succeed in the energy economy?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** Again, that's the natural extension of the first part. The other week, I was up at the Hydro One grid control centre, right next to Georgian College in Barrie, and you know what—

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Great spot.

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** And from that spot, they control 150,000 kilometres of the transmission and distribution centre covering the province of Ontario. They're able to make sure that the farms, families and businesses get the power they need. They identify the issues and then dispatch those very highly skilled workers to repair or to upgrade and renew issues. And they're working with Georgian and other colleges around the province to give students internships, co-op placements, to make sure the students get an opportunity for great jobs in the province and our transmission and distribution centre has the appropriately trained workers to make sure we have a clean, reliable, modern system fit for the people of Ontario.

### SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** My question is for the Minister of Education. Both on January 11 and February 1, I asked you to release Coulter Osborne's report on school busing. I know the minister has received this report, and I know it contains recommendations on the RFP process that has forced small businesses in many of our communities to stop their school bus routes. Last week, Don Drummond's report recommended the moratorium on the RFP process be lifted as soon as possible.

Minister, is the reason you're keeping the Osborne report secret because it cautions against monopolies in school busing and conflicts with Drummond's report?

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** I know that for many parents like myself and like the member opposite, perhaps, the school day begins the moment we put our kids on the bus. We know that that is so critically important: that our bus system and our school transportation system be safe, efficient and accountable. We know that school boards and operators share that goal with us. So, yes, I want to thank the task force for their efforts to study what is a very complex issue and to look at the many competing interests and needs.

I want you to know that I really appreciate the sector's support of the task force and the work and advice that they've given. I am currently reviewing the report and its recommendations, and it will provide guidance as we

make decisions, moving forward, on such a critically important issue.

1120

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** She's had the Osborne report for a month, and she's still reviewing it. Meanwhile, the school boards and consortiums have already gone out to tender.

I have a quick question for the minister. You saw the Osborne and Drummond reports before anyone else in the education sector. You've strung small independent operators along for months now. Why are you hiding the Osborne report? Does it conflict with Drummond, and does it caution you against creating monopolies like Ornge in the bus sector?

**Hon. Laurel Broten:** I think the complexity of the issue is evident from the member opposite's question. Her leader has said that their party would implement the entirety of Don Drummond's report. At the same time, we hear a query with respect to what advice we have gotten from another group of experts led by Coulter Osborne who brought together a group of diverse interests to give us some advice. It's incumbent upon me, as the minister, to take that advice and examine it in the context of how we ensure that public education—that starts when you put your kids on the bus—is safe and efficient and accountable as well.

That's what we are doing: We're taking a look at the report. Unlike the members opposite, we won't move aggressively and immediately without examining the facts and the circumstances and taking that advice and reflecting upon it.

## LABOUR RELATIONS

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Speaker, to the Premier: Caterpillar's actions in London have demonstrated an unprecedented level of corporate greed. Their refusal to negotiate, their demand for massive pay cuts and their decision to ship jobs south disgust people throughout the province and makes them wonder whether it could happen to them.

To make sure this doesn't happen again to any family, will the Premier agree to strike a commission into Caterpillar under section 37 of the Labour Relations Act?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Premier?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Economic Development and Innovation.

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** I appreciate the advice of the member opposite, but what I would say is this—there are really three things, I think, that need to be said in response to that question. The first is that our concern is and will always be the workers who are there. The Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities was there, on the spot, within hours of that unfortunate announcement being made.

Secondly, we can't let these occurrences dampen our determination to continue to build a strong economy in Ontario. That has got to be job number one. The fact is,

we did create 121,300 net jobs last year in the province of Ontario.

Thirdly, I want to thank the third party and the leader of the third party, and I want to thank the Premier, for standing up for those workers in London. I do have to ask where the Leader of the Opposition was on this, because he has been asked numerous times: Will he stand with those workers or will he not? Mr. Speaker, he has refused to answer that question.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** It's pretty clear that the Premier's no-strings-attached corporate tax giveaways aren't working, and neither is his lack of action. Several columnists have noted that the Premier didn't even pick up the phone to the company or the Prime Minister.

The province needs to act to secure jobs in this province by rewarding companies that create good jobs, strengthening labour laws and bringing in a buy-Ontario program. What is the Premier's plan?

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** I think it's really important that, as we sympathize with the challenges that these workers are going through, what they expect of us is to ensure that the supports are there for those workers as they go through this transition.

The other thing that they would expect of us is to continue to work diligently to create jobs in that part of the province. That's why our southwestern Ontario development fund is so important. So I ask the members opposite—I ask the members of the NDP, and I ask the members of the PC Party—to give very good consideration to supporting what is a very important piece of legislation that's going to create jobs in southwestern Ontario. I know the people of London are looking forward to that fund being approved in this Legislature, and I hope I can count on the members opposite to support that.

## ROAD SAFETY

**Mrs. Teresa Piruzza:** My question is for the Minister of Transportation. On January 18, a terrible tragedy occurred on Highway 3 in Windsor. A tow truck driver was hit and killed while helping another motorist change a tire. It was daytime, weather conditions were normal, the driver was well-trained and their amber lights were flashing.

Speaker, through you, my question to the minister is: What do drivers need to know when encountering road-side assistance vehicles, or any vehicle for that matter, on the road in distress so that these types of tragedies can be avoided?

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Windsor West for asking this question, and I certainly share her concerns about this tragedy.

We are looking at everything we know so far about the circumstances. There certainly aren't many answers to the question of why this actually happened. The driver of the vehicle is facing charges, and through that process we may learn more about what actually transpired in those

few seconds. But this is a stark reminder of the care that needs to be taken by every single driver every time they get behind the wheel, because things can happen in an instant when care is not taken.

When you see any vehicle in distress on the side of the road, be mindful of the fact that there may be people moving around the outside of that vehicle. That's just common sense. Being alert, cognizant and considerate of road users is the best way to keep roads safe for people.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mrs. Teresa Piruzza:** Thank you, Minister. I spend quite a bit of time on the roads and highways in and around Windsor and around here, and I can tell you that there's no substitute in terms of safety for being alert and being aware of what's going on around you at all times.

Every day, more than 1,000 tow truck operators take to the roads in Ontario, helping drivers in sometimes very difficult and dangerous conditions. It is a unique industry and certainly one that provides an important service to Ontario drivers.

Speaker, can the minister acknowledge that, moving forward, he will consider appropriate measures to strengthen this industry, whose members are there to help us day and night?

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** Mr. Speaker, once again, I share the member's concerns. Absolutely. I am always open to thoughtful ideas on how to strengthen standards in this industry, because, as the member noted, it has a significant presence on our roads and highways.

I recall that the member for Willowdale had a bill before the House last spring much to that effect that I was supportive of.

I think it's an important discussion to have, but it's important that the discussion be broad-based, looks at the industry as a whole and takes into account the inputs of the police, the CAA and other stakeholders.

Ontario consistently has the safest roads in North America. Statistics always show this to be the case. But unfortunately, driver error remains the number one cause of fatal conditions on the roads.

The member is right: There is no legislation or regulation that will ever substitute for alert and defensive driving. This is something for all drivers to remember before heading out onto the road.

#### PAN AM GAMES

**Mr. Rod Jackson:** My question is to the minister responsible for the Pan Am Games. There's something terribly problematic with the Pan Am tendering in Hamilton. It starts at the top of the Liberal-appointed Pan Am organizing committee and board, who turn a blind eye to the broken tendering process, which the city of Hamilton is complaining favours the Working Families Coalition unions. The nepotism for the Working Families Coalition unions effectively shrinks the competition by 75%, which drives costs up—up to 40% higher.

What makes the government feel entitled to make the hard-earned money of the hard-working Ontario tax-

payers finance their cheap political advertisers with inflated bids?

**Hon. Charles Sousa:** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to talk about the Pan Am Games coming to Ontario. The fact of the matter is, we're going to be able to host a game of up to 10,000 athletes—the largest set of games ever hosted by the province of Ontario. It's going to bring for us a number of great legacies, including economic development: over 15,000 new jobs in the province. It's also going to help athleticism and elite athletes now be able to train and perform within the jurisdiction of Ontario, as well as helping many social and community groups.

In regards to his question and the insinuations made, I congratulate Infrastructure Ontario for the outstanding work they've done with tendering the process of all the venues that have been brought forward. We are trying our best to maintain the lowest and best price possible for the delivery of these games, and we look forward to seeing them come in 2015.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

1130

**Mr. Rod Jackson:** Speaker, how can the minister justify millions of wasted dollars lining the pockets of their union friends on the backs of taxpayers? Indeed, this legislated nepotism in the tendering process costs the city of Hamilton about \$4 million to \$10 million in additional dollars per year in inflated construction bids.

Here is what's wrong: accountability. The Liberal Pan Am organizing committee and board report to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, the Minister of Infrastructure has Infrastructure Ontario managing Pan Am projects, and the Minister of Sport is undefined in this role. Which one of you ministers will stand up and explain to the city of Hamilton and Ontario taxpayers why you're turning a blind eye to tolerate nepotism in the tendering process costing the city and Ontario taxpayers millions of dollars annually?

**Hon. Charles Sousa:** Mr. Speaker, just by the amount of RFPs that are out there, the proponents that are being awarded would indicate otherwise. The fact of the matter is we are providing an open and transparent process. It's in the midst of going through that right now. We need to ensure we get the best possible price for the taxpayers in delivering these games, and I'm very confident that we are doing exactly what the delivery of these games will bring to Ontario as a result of the great work that Infrastructure Ontario is providing.

I should also state that until this point, we have only spent 3% of the entire budget of \$1.4 billion. We need to take every precautionary step possible to ensure that we deliver the games on time and on budget.

#### ADDICTION SERVICES

**Ms. Sarah Campbell:** My question is to the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. As I'm sure you're aware, prescription drug abuse is an epidemic in northern communities. In my riding, the community of Cat Lake

has declared a state of emergency as a result of prescription drug abuse. Other First Nations communities report addiction rates as high as 50% to 70%.

On Friday, it was announced that OxyContin will no longer be available in Canada. While this should help prevent further addiction, it does little to help those who are currently addicted. What is this government's plan, and does this government have a strategy to assist First Nations communities struggling with staggering rates of addiction?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you to the member opposite. She has raised a very, very important question. I think members of this House know that the issue of prescription drug abuse, and particularly OxyContin, is one that has taken a significant amount of my personal time, because I do know that we've got a lot of work to do.

We know that OxyContin will no longer be manufactured by Purdue pharmaceutical and that there is a new drug that is far less likely to be used for illicit purposes, Speaker. We do have an issue that we are working to address.

The federal government, of course, is responsible for delivering health care in those First Nations communities. But this is an issue of concern, and I want to assure the member opposite that we are looking into it.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Sarah Campbell:** First Nations communities have been asking for help for years, but their requests have fallen on deaf ears. Minister, First Nations people are the citizens of this province, and they're crying out for help. Leaders in the north are terrified about what may happen if entire communities are forced to go off the drug cold turkey. Time is of the essence. When will this government release a comprehensive plan?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, we released our addictions and mental health strategy several months ago. Part of that strategy is dealing with this addiction to prescription narcotics. There is much, much work to be done—I am very well aware of that—and I want you to know that we are very much focused on this issue.

## FOREST INDUSTRY

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for—sorry.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Glengarry—Prescott—Russell.

**Mr. Grant Crack:** The best for last. Thank you, Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. Minister, a new program has been designed to encourage Ontarians to buy locally when thinking about purchasing wood products, and while it's still in its initial stages, Ontarians will soon be able to identify the origins of the wood they are buying at their local hardware or furniture store because of the new Ontario Wood logo that will help spot homegrown wood products. The Ontario Wood

logo builds on the success of Foodland Ontario, the logo before it, which is used by over 300 companies and food processors in Ontario.

I know that the Ontario wood logo will receive similar uptake and is yet another step that our government is taking in order to restore the competitiveness of Ontario's forestry sector. Mr. Speaker, through you to the minister, can the minister inform the members of this House how this new initiative will create jobs for Ontarians?

**Hon. Michael Gravelle:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly want to thank the member for bringing our new Ontario Wood logo to the attention of the House and all Ontarians.

The Ontario Wood initiative is yet another part of our plan to create jobs in the forestry sector and strengthen the Ontario economy. An Ontario Wood logo will encourage Ontario families to think about where the wood products they buy come from. From lumber to furniture, Ontarians will be able to identify made-in-Ontario wood, allowing them to buy locally and help keep jobs in communities across Ontario—and I can tell you, Speaker, we know that Ontarians, if they have an opportunity to buy locally, Ontario-made wood, that's what they would like to do.

Certainly, I want to thank the Ontario Forest Industries Association, the OFIA, for their support and being the first licensed user of the Ontario Wood logo. Certainly, it is strong partnerships with industry members that will drive the success of this program and consumers around the world to choose made-in-Ontario wood. We're very proud of it, Speaker. Thank you.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** There are no deferred votes. This House stands recessed until 3 p.m. this afternoon.

*The House recessed from 1136 to 1500.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Introduction of guests.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and welcome back, by the way.

I'm delighted to introduce the Trans Lobby Group. We have with us some incredible advocates: Susan Gapka, Doug Arcand, Stefanknee Wolscht, Martine Stonehouse, Davina Hader, Georgina Bencsik, Christin Milloy and Nicole Nussbaum. So, welcome all.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Welcome. Further introductions?

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** It's my pleasure to introduce Kathy Argiropoulos, Maria Daskalos, Jim Parthenis, Christine Theolis, Nicholas Theolis, Dimitri Theolis and Maria Tsiopoulos, who are here today for the introduction of a petition on Dimitra Daskalos.

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** I also want to welcome all the members of the Trans Lobby Group who are here and commend them for the good work that they've been

doing and, in particular, my very good friend Georgina Bencsik, who's part of the group. Thank you for joining us at Queen's Park.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### STUDENT DEMONSTRATION

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** Mr. Speaker, reports indicate that earlier this month at the University of Western Ontario protestors disrupted a non-political Israel on Campus event, preventing students from entering an Israel Day exhibit. Incidents like these highlight the necessity of standing up against any movement aimed at intimidating and denigrating Jewish students or students of any minority group. Post-secondary institutions are the place for peaceful dialogue and debate, not propaganda and intimidation.

That's why during the previous term I brought forward a resolution to condemn the term "Israel Apartheid Week." I am proud to say that the resolution was passed unanimously with support across all party lines in this House. We all agreed that real solutions begin with debate based on facts, ingrained in truth and carried out with respect for opposing points of view.

I know that many constituents in my riding of Thornhill have children who attend post-secondary institutions across this province, including the university mentioned, and I know that events such as the incident at Western make them concerned for the safety of their children.

In passing the resolution to condemn the term "Israel Apartheid Week," I know that this House showed concerned parents that we expect institutions, organizations and individuals across this province to hold peaceful and truthful debates and never allow cowardice, propaganda and intimidation tactics.

### DIMITRA DASKALOS

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** I rise today on the very sad anniversary of the death of Dimitra Daskalos. She drew her last breath at Toronto General Hospital exactly one year ago. All deaths are sad, but some, like this one, are also tragic.

Her daughter, Maria, and other members of her family are here today because they do not want Dimitra's death to have been in vain. They do not want other families to go through what they have gone through, what their mother went through. Maria's mother was desperately ill and needed hospital care. She was treated as a bed blocker and her family was given a bill for almost \$19,000 for her time in hospital.

The Minister of Health has publicly told us that hospitals aren't able to use threats of such bills against a family. Clearly, given that this is not the only example, the minister's word is not reflected in hospital practice.

Maria raised concerns about infection control and the risk of exposure that her mother was under and was turned over to patient relations. She has asked the minister to investigate, as have I. Failing that, she has asked that the government allow the Ombudsman to be given jurisdiction.

No more daughters should be forced to come here for action after their parents have died. Speaker, the minister must act.

### KINDNESS WEEK

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** Today at Queen's Park, we launch the third annual Kindness Week. It is an initiative that started in Ottawa in my home community some five years ago. The idea is simple one: that we should engage in random acts of kindness. A simple message but a strong message and an important one that together we, every single day, should do our best to be kind to others and engage in kind acts.

There is a great group of people in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, who are engaged in this initiative. I want to thank MPP Liz Witmer and MPP France Gélinas for their support for this initiative right here at Queen's Park and encourage all members of the Legislature to take the simple but strong message back to their communities and initiate Kindness Week activities.

One other thing, Speaker, thanks to your co-operation, what we engage in this year is to collect sleepwear for abused women and children who are fleeing domestic violence. All of those things will be going to Interval House in Ottawa. Members, staff, everybody can drop gently used or new sleepwear items at the Speaker's office any time for the next week or two.

Lastly, I want to thank the steering committee in Ottawa for the Kindness Week initiative—Rabbi Reuven Bulka, Stephen Lau, Candace Derrickx, Stacey Segal, Lauren Hunter, Dustin Truscio, Kimberly Francoeur, Amy Desjardins, Sonya Kinkade, Julie Lefrancois, Elizabeth Cleland, Jeff Turner, Diana Mitoff, Sharon Diamond, Stacey Diffin-Lafleur, Rosemary Walsh, Trevor Clost, Emily Bolton, Stuart Buist, Scott Oakley and Taline Jirian—for all their hard work in making Kindness Week a successful week in Ottawa and across the province.

### ROB SHOULDICE

**Mr. Bill Walker:** On December 23, my riding of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound lost a great man with the passing of Rob "The Stoneman" Shouldice.

Rob joined the business his father, Bev, and mother, Dorothy, started when he was 16 years old and he would have celebrated 50 years in business in 2012. Rob, along with his wife, June, transformed the traditional cement block company his parents started in 1947. He experimented and patented "designer stone," which is now the base of the company and is sold across the province and across North America.

The third-generation family business—his sons are now carrying on the proud tradition—employs 150 people and has deep roots in the Shallow Lake area reaching back to the 1800s.

People who knew him and worked with him universally say that he was a man of his word, a leader, a great salesman and an innovator, a person who would always ask “Why not?” as opposed to “Why” when faced with a challenge.

Rob Shouldice was a proud promoter of the village in which he was born and grew up, always very dedicated to Shallow Lake and his local community. He was a generous and faithful contributor to many local causes, albeit in a very humble and quiet way. He loved his life and lived every day like it was his last. He was a very successful entrepreneur and businessman; however, he lived by the principle of family first.

Rob is survived by his wife of 41 years, June; his sons Steve, Mark and Brad; his girls Mary, Heather and Lyndsy; and eight cherished grandchildren: Ben, A.J., Jonah, Samantha, Ty, Ellie, Wyatt and Madin; his mom, Dorothy; his brother, Doug and his wife, Cathy; and sisters Joan and her husband, John Lever, and Dale and her husband, Eric Robinson, and extended family.

My community mourns this great individual and my sympathies go out to his family.

**Speaker of the House:** Thank you, and ours too.

#### LONG-TERM CARE

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** I want to add to what my colleague Peter Tabuns was saying. At the end of next month, 30 ALC beds will be closed at the Memorial site of the Sudbury hospital. I've already talked to the CEO of our LHIN, the CEO of our CCAC and of our hospital, and they're all saying the same thing: These beds must close due to a lack of funds—and then the scary part—but there's no clear plan that exists to make sure that the frail, elderly people in the beds get to go to a long-term-care home of their choosing.

Closing those beds without providing acceptable options to those people is disrespectful and it is cruel.

Two years ago, we went through the same scenario of closing ALC beds in Sudbury. Mrs. Ransom is still paying for that decision. She has to take two buses every day to go feed and visit her mother who was forced into a home that she did not choose, or threatened with payments.

Carol St. Jacques's father has been waiting for three years for admission into a long-term care home of his choosing. What will happen to him? He is in one of those beds. Will he be forced to pay like what happened to that family?

The scenario is playing out with people who cannot advocate for themselves, people that deserve our protection. Warehousing them into a safe and dry place is not enough. They should be allowed to go to a long-term-care home of their choosing. Until that happens, I cannot agree to the closing of those beds.

1510

#### LENT

**Mr. Joe Dickson:** I rise in the House today to mark the beginning of Lent, which begins tomorrow, February 22.

Lent is a 40-day liturgical season that initiates the most sacred part of the Christian year. Lent begins on Ash Wednesday and concludes on the great vigil of Easter. Sundays are not included in the 40-day count because every Sunday is a joyful celebration of our Lord's resurrection.

On these days, penance is to be considered an important requirement of the Christian life. Fulfillment of this duty involves prayer, works of piety and charity, and self-denial by fulfilling one's obligations more faithfully, including fasting and abstinence.

In the Roman rite, Ash Wednesday and Good Friday—and all Fridays—are days of fasting and abstinence from meat, with one full meal and two lighter meals per day.

We of the Christian faith will celebrate Good Friday on April 6 and Easter Sunday on April 8.

It may be appropriate as well, Mr. Speaker, at this time to pass on our great wishes from everyone here in the Legislature today as we acknowledge the archbishop of the diocese of Toronto, Thomas Christopher Collins, who has been elevated to the position of cardinal by Pope Benedict. This includes Toronto, Peel, York and Durham region as far north as Georgian Bay. Congratulations, Cardinal Collins.

#### JEAN PIGOTT

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** Today I remember a city builder, a great Canadian and, for me, a dear friend. Known as one of the three Morrison sisters—and the eldest, the others being Gay Cook and Grete Hale—Jean Pigott was a businesswoman who turned around her father's company, Morrison Lamothe, well before women were in the boardrooms in this nation.

She ran two royal tours and one for the Pope. She was the director of appointments for Prime Minister Joe Clark and she was named the chair of the National Capital Commission by Prime Minister Mulroney.

As someone who moved to Ottawa later in my life, I appreciated Jean's contribution because she believed, and she instilled in all of us, that Ottawa is every Canadian's second hometown.

But perhaps, Mr. Speaker, what brought Jean and me closest together is a very rare bond in Ottawa politics. We are the only two women to ever have been elected as Ontario and federal Progressive Conservatives in our city. Jean was elected in 1976 in a by-election for Ottawa—Carleton, which is now the riding of Ottawa Centre, which Mr. Naqvi represents. It took 30 years almost to the date before another Progressive Conservative female was elected in the city of Ottawa. That time,

it was me, in a by-election, to represent Nepean—Carleton in this place.

Jean was everything that I had ever asked for in a mentor. She was a great friend and a dear supporter. When it became known that I wasn't the favoured choice of my particular political party in Toronto, Jean Pigott and a number of other women—Walter Baker's daughter Nancy, and Georgie Tupper, the wife of Bill Tupper, the former MP for my riding—stood behind me, among another group of women who really wanted to see another Conservative elected.

I first met Jean in 1999 when I was a young Conservative staffer. She and her sisters, on Sir John A. Macdonald's birthday, came to Parliament Hill and had a birthday party for Sir John A. Many years later, she would endorse me, which was something, Mr. Speaker, I was in awe of for many years.

Her grace, her wisdom and her wonderful character were something that has instilled a great deal of pride, both in myself and among many other people in the city of Ottawa.

She created a great relationship with my husband, whom she would call from time to time when he was working in the Senate, to share great stories and gossip with. And, of course, my daughter Victoria benefited from great stories I could tell about Jean's Ottawa, along with many of the other city builders.

But, Mr. Speaker, today I am in tribute of Jean Pigott and the great things that she did for the city of Ottawa and our nation. I just want to say also that she wasn't just a role model for me or other members of the Progressive Conservative Party; she was a role model for city councillors like Jan Harder and Maria McRae as well as for journalists in the city of Ottawa like Susan Sherring.

So today I just want, on behalf of the women of Ontario, the women of this Legislature and the people of Ottawa, to say thank you to Jean Pigott for her great contributions to our nation and to our city. Rest in peace, Jean.

#### ELEANOR MILLER

**Mr. Bill Mauro:** On February 14, Thunder Bay lost one of its finest and most accomplished citizens with the passing of Eleanor Joan Miller, more commonly known as Dusty Miller, at the age of 82.

Dusty Miller was likely best known to the public for two things: first, the fact that she became the first female mayor of the amalgamated city of Thunder Bay, formed by the joining of the former cities of Port Arthur and Fort William; second, for her incredible contribution to the building of a remarkable and vibrant arts and cultural community in our city.

She was an Order of Ontario recipient. She received the Maggie Bassett Award for her outstanding contribution to theatre. She directed the Port Arthur Community Players, later to become the Cambrian Players, and Lakehead Musical Productions, and she was a member of Theatre Northwest, later to become Magnus

Theatre, as well as serving on numerous boards and committees. In fact, there are too many to mention in the time allowed to me today.

Dusty was first elected to city council in 1974, serving till 1978, when she ran for mayor and was successful in defeating Walter Assef. For those who know a little of Thunder Bay's politics, defeating Walter Assef was no small feat. After her term as mayor, Dusty Miller continued to serve her community in elected office as a councillor from 1985 to 1991.

Dusty Miller's legacy includes many contributions, including the Thunder Bay Community Auditorium, one of the finest concert halls in North America, if I might say so. Along with her late husband, Tom Miller, a former professor of mine at Lakehead University, and many others, they helped transform what was formerly Lakehead Technical Institute into Lakehead University.

Those who have held elected office know just how difficult our work can be. I think the words spoken by current councillor Ken Boshcoff, first elected to public office the night Dusty became mayor in 1978, are appropriate and fitting. He said he quickly learned from Dusty Miller that what was best for the city was not always the popular route. Dusty was highly principled and courageous, to the point that it cost her the mayoralty after only one term.

Dusty Miller's commitment to our city was extraordinary. Speaker, my sympathies to her family and friends. Thunder Bay has lost one of its finest.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you very much.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Introduction of bills?

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Oh, sorry. My apologies. The member for Durham.

#### GOVERNMENT'S RECORD

**Mr. John O'Toole:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm surprised at the change of order there.

As the opposition critic for accountability, I would like to remind this government and Premier McGuinty what accountability truly means. It is a very familiar concept, one that this government has found very difficult to understand. Accountability is the acknowledgement and assumption of responsibility for one's actions. The fact is that rather than accept responsibility, this government has chosen to blame those around them.

In scandals such as Ornge, he blames the public sector; eHealth scandal, he blames everyone; failing economy, he blames Europe and Greece; failing health care system, he blames Stephen Harper in Ottawa. The pattern is quite simple, and it can be well understood. When presented with the consequences of his actions, the Premier has skirted the responsibility. He has chosen to ignore responsibility and to ignore his duty to the people of Ontario.

Our great province deserves more accountability in this government. Our people deserve better than Dalton McGuinty. A report card from Don Drummond clearly reveals that after eight years of McGuinty and this government, it's time to own up and accept responsibility for your actions.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** This ends members' statements.

#### TABLING OF SESSIONAL PAPERS

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** I beg to inform the House that during the adjournment, the following reports were tabled:

—On December 14, 2011, a special report entitled Investigation into the Ministry of the Attorney General's implementation of recommendations concerning reform of the Special Investigations Unit, from the Ombudsman;

—On January 10, 2012, a special report entitled Biodiversity: A Nation's Commitment, an Obligation for Ontario, a special report to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, from the Environmental Commissioner;

—on February 17, 2012, a report on the election returns with statistics from the records of the 2009-10 by-elections and 2011 general election from the Chief Electoral Officer.

1520

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### MAJOR-GENERAL SIR ISAAC BROCK DAY ACT, 2012

##### LOI DE 2012 SUR LE JOUR DU MAJOR-GÉNÉRAL SIR ISAAC BROCK

Mr. Clark moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 32, An Act to proclaim October 13 in each year as Major-General Sir Isaac Brock Day in Ontario / Projet de loi 32, Loi visant à proclamer le 13 octobre de chaque année Jour du major-général Sir Isaac Brock en Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Mr. Clark for a brief statement?

**Mr. Steve Clark:** Madam Speaker, I'm not going to read the explanatory note. I would like to thank the member for Welland and the member for Niagara Falls for co-sponsoring this bill, as well as the favourable comments that the Minister of the Environment has given me.

This year, as most people know, is the 200th anniversary of the War of 1812, and there are several events planned throughout the province. Major-General Sir Isaac Brock was the commander of the military forces in Upper Canada at the time of the war.

The date October 13 was chosen to commemorate the day of his death at the Battle of Queenston Heights,

which was considered by many to be a pivotal battle as part of the War of 1812. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

##### TOBY'S ACT (RIGHT TO BE FREE FROM DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT BECAUSE OF GENDER IDENTITY OR GENDER EXPRESSION), 2012

##### LOI TOBY DE 2012 SUR LE DROIT À L'ABSENCE DE DISCRIMINATION ET DE HARCÈLEMENT FONDÉS SUR L'IDENTITÉ OU L'EXPRESSION SEXUELLES

Ms. DiNovo moved first reading of the following bill:  
Bill 33, An Act to amend the Human Rights Code with respect to gender identity and gender expression / Projet de loi 33, Loi modifiant le Code des droits de la personne en ce qui concerne l'identité et l'expression sexuelles.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Ms. DiNovo, you may make a brief statement.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. This bill amends the Human Rights Code to specify—and “specify” is a critical word here—that every person has a right to equal treatment without discrimination because of gender identity or gender expression with respect to (a) services, goods and facilities; (b) accommodation; (c) contracting; (d) employment; (e) membership in a trade union, trade or occupational association or self-governing profession. The bill also amends the code to specify that every person has a right to be free from harassment because of gender identity or gender expression with respect to accommodation and employment.

I want to thank the member from Ottawa Centre and also the member from Whitby–Oshawa for co-authoring this bill, and the trans lobby for being here to support it. Thank you.

#### MOTIONS

##### PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

**Hon. John Milloy:** Madam Speaker, I believe we have unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice regarding private members' public business.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Agreed? Agreed. Thank you.

**Hon. John Milloy:** I move that, notwithstanding standing order 98(b), the following change be made to the ballot list for private members' public business:

Mr. Zimmer and Ms. Damerla exchange places in the order of precedence such that Mr. Zimmer assumes ballot item 15 and Ms. Damerla assumes ballot item number 25; and that Mrs. Mangat and Mr. Sergio exchange

places in the order of precedence such that Mrs. Mangat assumes ballot item number 21 and Mr. Sergio assumes ballot item number 32.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*Motion agreed to.*

## PETITIONS

### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I have a petition here signed by a great number of my constituents in Oxford, and it's to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas Tavistock's Bonnie Brae Health Care Centre is an 80-bed, D-class nursing home that must be either rebuilt or closed by July 2014; and

"Whereas there is currently an application by a private operator to move the 80 licensed beds outside of Oxford county to the city of London, despite the recent opening of two other long-term-care homes in Middlesex county in 2010; and

"Whereas long-term-care wait times in Oxford county can be as much as 134 days longer than in Middlesex county; and

"Whereas Tavistock receives referrals from the nearby Waterloo Wellington CCAC, which has among the highest waits for long-term care in the province;

"We, the undersigned, request that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario retain these beds in Tavistock and seek partners to fast-track replacement of the Bonnie Brae as part of Ontario's 10-year plan to modernize 35,000 long-term care beds."

Madam Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to read this petition into the record, and I affix my signature as I wholeheartedly agree with this petition.

### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** A petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas much of the suffering of the late Dimitra Daskalos while in the hands of the health care system of Ontario could have been avoided;

"Whereas the Minister of Health has publicly stated that elderly patients in hospital in need of long-term care are not to be subjected to threats of heavy fees by hospitals in order to get them to leave those hospitals;

"Whereas Dimitra Daskalos and her family were subjected to such pressure, as have other families;

"Whereas patients and their families have not found satisfaction of their grievances in investigations by hospital-based patient advocates or ombudsmen;

"Whereas it is clear that there is a shortage of home care and quality long-term care for the elderly;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To do all within its power to ensure that there is adequate home and long-term care for the elderly;

"To grant powers of investigation of health system problems to the Ombudsman of Ontario;

"To direct the Minister of Health to make sure her directions regarding extra billing used to force patients out of hospital beds while they await long-term care are actually followed."

Speaker, I support this petition. I add my signature, the 5,374th, to this petition and pass it on to you.

*Applause.*

### KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** What an incredible response to a petition.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, Canada, draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to the following:

"Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada;

"Whereas real progress has been made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease, in particular the development of a bioartificial kidney;

"We, the undersigned, call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make research funding available for the explicit purpose of conducting bioartificial kidney research as an extension to the research being successfully conducted at several centres in the United States."

Madam Speaker, I agree with this petition and will affix my signature to it.

1530

### SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for Nepean—Carleton.

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It's wonderful to see you back in 2012.

I have a very important petition, signed by the students and the parents of Longfields-Davidson Heights Secondary School, and it is petitioning the Legislative Assembly.

"During the academic year 2012-13, LDHSS"—Longfields-Davidson Heights Secondary School—"will have a need of 24 portables to accommodate all the students. In year 2013-14 there would be a minimum of 28 portables, year 2014-15 there would be a minimum of 30 portables, and year 2015-16 there would be a minimum of 35 portables on site.

"It is imperative for the Ministry of Education to recognize and acknowledge the seriousness of this overcrowding issue and lack of space at the LDHSS immediately.

"We are urging the ministry to provide the capital funding to build the additional wing. This will allow children of the community to attend their community public school and receive a high quality of education in a

facility that has adequate specialized classroom space and other facilities.”

Madam Speaker, as you're aware, Nepean–Carleton has one of the fastest-growing communities in all of Canada in Barrhaven, which had 25% growth in the last five years. Therefore, as the member of provincial Parliament for Nepean–Carleton, I support the students and the parents of Longfields-Davidson Heights school, and I affix my signature and am very proud that the students took the time to fill 750 names on this petition.

### DIAGNOSTIC SERVICES

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** I have this petition from the people of Sudbury and Nickel Belt.

“Whereas the Ontario government made PET scanning ... a publicly insured health service; and

“Whereas,” since October 2009, “insured PET scans” are performed “in Ottawa, London, Toronto, Hamilton and Thunder Bay; and

“Whereas the city of Greater Sudbury is a hub for health care in northeastern Ontario, with Health Sciences North, the regional cancer program and the Northern Ontario School of Medicine;

“We ... petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make PET scans available through Health Sciences North, thereby serving and providing equitable access to the citizens of northeastern Ontario.”

I fully support this petition. I will affix my name to it and ask page Jason to bring it to the clerks.

### KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Today I'm pleased to present a petition on behalf of Bonnie Easer, who lives in Bewdley, Ontario, which is actually in the riding of Northumberland–Quinte West, but did drop this petition by my office. It says:

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, Canada, draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to the following:

“Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada;

“Whereas real progress is being made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease, in particular the development of a bioartificial kidney;

“We, the undersigned, call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make research funding available for the explicit purpose of conducting bioartificial kidney research as an extension to the research being successfully conducted at several centres in the United States.”

I agree with this petition and will affix my signature to it.

### CURRICULUM

**Mr. Steve Clark:** I want to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Denise Bowes and Joy Goodfellow, who

brought this petition to me. They just started collecting signatures in December, and they've done a tremendous job in mobilizing public support. It's a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas the Ministry of Education has deemed music an essential subject in elementary schools and the ministry arts curriculum states that high-quality instruction is key to student success in arts education; and

“Whereas, according to a 2010 Coalition for Music Education study, 58% of all elementary schools in Ontario are without a qualified music teacher capable of teaching the ministry curriculum; and

“Whereas, due to classroom capping and staff cuts, school boards are unable to provide this essential subject with teachers who have the expertise to ensure student success; and

“Whereas protecting music in elementary schools would ensure children benefit from the many positive aspects of this essential subject;

“Therefore we, the undersigned, call on the Minister of Education to declare music in Ontario elementary schools a protected subject, thus ensuring teachers delivering the program are familiar with the elements of music, can read and interpret music and are able to communicate in a musical way.”

I'm pleased to affix my signature to the petition and send it to the table with page Katelyn.

### WIND TURBINES

**Mr. Todd Smith:** This is on behalf of the hundreds of residents in Prince Edward county, in my riding of Prince Edward–Hastings.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the proposed Gilead Power project in Prince Edward county is currently planned for an area that the municipality has designated for another purpose; and

“Whereas it's the opinion of real estate experts in Prince Edward county that the installation of the Gilead industrial wind factory will negatively impact property values and the tourism sector, which is vital to the economic success of Prince Edward county; and

“Whereas other jurisdictions have recognized that it is environmentally counterproductive to put industrial wind factories in important bird areas, such as the one that exists on the south shore of Prince Edward county; and

“Whereas that recognition was also accepted by the Senate of Canada through a unanimous resolution;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“That the public consultation period for the EBR project number 011-5239, also known as the Gilead project, be extended to April 1 to allow the community sufficient time to make clear their arguments as to the negative impact that the project will have on the people, economy and ecology of Prince Edward county.”

## CLIMATE CHANGE

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas global climate change is the most serious threat facing humanity and poses significant risks to our environment, economy, society and human health; and

"More than 97% of scientists working in the disciplines contributing to studies of our climate and all national science academies accept that climate change is almost certainly being caused by human activities mainly due to the use of fossil fuels; and

"The objective of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is 'stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system'; and

"Climate scientists are now warning us that limiting global temperature increase to 1.5 degrees centigrade is essential; and

"Ontario has a clear responsibility to reduce our emissions given that our per capita greenhouse gas emissions—as are most in North America—"are among the highest in the world; and

"With the introduction of the Green Energy Act and feed-in tariff program, Ontario is an example to the rest of the world of the principle of renewable energy development; and

"The best research today indicates that energy demands are decreasing and that sufficient potential energy from a diverse supply of renewable sources exists to meet Ontario's current and projected energy demands;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Immediately prepare a plan that requires that 100% of Ontario's stationary energy be from zero-carbon sources before the end of 2023, with a timeline to be audited annually by the Auditor General and published reports."

I submit this on behalf of Zero Carbon Ontario, and I put my signature on it as well.

## WIND TURBINES

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas there is a growing body of evidence confirming industrial wind development has serious adverse effects on host communities;

"Whereas over 135 people in Ontario have reported serious negative health effects from industrial wind development, and at least a dozen families have been bought out of their homes;

"Whereas Ontario's Green Energy Act has ended local planning control by stripping municipal councils of their rights;

"Whereas 80 municipal councils, representing two million Ontarians, called on the government to put in place a full moratorium on industrial wind development

until an independent epidemiological health study is completed, proper environmental regulations and protections are put in place, and local democracy is restored;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Immediately put a moratorium on all industrial wind proposals; fund an independent epidemiological health study to develop safe setbacks; legislate those findings; develop stringent environmental protection standards for natural areas; and require all projects to comply with regulations based on science and local planning."

I'm happy to sign that petition.

## KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I'm pleased to present a petition today on behalf of my neighbour, Lois Kelly, who lives beside me on 327 Maniece Avenue in Peterborough, Ontario.

"Petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, Canada, draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to the following:

"Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada;

"Whereas real progress has been made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease, in particular the development of a bioartificial kidney;

"We, the undersigned, call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make research funding available for the explicit purpose of conducting bioartificial kidney research as an extension to the research being successfully conducted at several centres in the United States."

I agree with this petition and will affix my signature to it.

## WIND TURBINES

**Mr. John O'Toole:** "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the proposed Gilead power project in Prince Edward county is currently planned for an area that the municipality has designated for another purpose; and

"Whereas it's the opinion of the real estate experts in Prince Edward county that the installation of the Gilead industrial wind factory will negatively impact property values and the tourism sector, which is vital to the economic success of Prince Edward county; and

"Whereas other jurisdictions have recognized that it is environmentally counterproductive to put industrial wind factories in important bird areas, such as the one that exists on the south shore of Prince Edward county; and

"Whereas that recognition was also accepted by the Senate of Canada through a unanimous resolution;

"We, the undersigned, therefore petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the public consultation period for the EBR project number 011-5239, also known as the Gilead project, be extended to April 1 to allow the community sufficient time to make clear their arguments as to the

negative impact that the project will have on the people, economy and ecology of Prince Edward county.”

I'm pleased to sign in support of the people from Wind Concerns Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. The time for petitions has expired.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### HEALTHY HOMES RENOVATION TAX CREDIT ACT, 2012

#### LOI DE 2012 SUR LE CRÉDIT D'IMPÔT POUR L'AMÉNAGEMENT DU LOGEMENT AXÉ SUR LE BIEN-ÊTRE

Resuming the debate adjourned on December 8, 2011, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 2, An Act to amend the Taxation Act, 2007 to implement a healthy homes renovation tax credit / Projet de loi 2, Loi modifiant la Loi de 2007 sur les impôts en vue de mettre en oeuvre le crédit d'impôt pour l'aménagement du logement axé sur le bien-être.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate? The member for Toronto—Danforth.

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** Thank you, Speaker. It's a privilege to be able to rise here today to talk about this government bill, the Healthy Homes Renovation Tax Credit Act, 2012.

I have to say to you, Speaker, that the title of the bill is much grander than the bill itself. The bill is fairly straightforward. It allows for households, residences of seniors, to be able to claim tax credits for modifications for ramps or bathroom rebuilding so that those homes are accessible to those seniors.

But I want to say that first of all, if you're a senior—let's say you're trying to get along on Canada pension and OAS and Gains—you have to have a fair amount of money in the first place to be able to invest in that house in order to claim this credit. It's 15% of what you invest, so if you have \$10,000 you can get up to \$1,500 back. I don't know about you, Speaker—I meet a lot of seniors as I go door-to-door in my riding, and many of them would be very hard-pressed to pull together \$10,000 for home renovations.

So this bill, this tax credit may be helpful to those seniors who do have ready cash at hand but will be of very, very limited use to the large numbers of seniors who are just trying to hold it together—seniors who, in my experience, talk to me about the difficulties they face with pensions that do not keep up with their cost of living; seniors who talk to me about property taxes that go up faster than their incomes and do not reflect their ability to pay, and those seniors who are continuing to carry the burden of the provincial download of expenses that was made in the Harris era and has been continued by this Liberal government. Those seniors are very worried about their ability to stay in their homes.

Speaker, I have great confidence that everyone in this House knows that seniors need support. They need support to be able to stay in their homes and maintain their independence as long as they possibly can. But to assume that the majority of seniors in this province have the money to make full use of this tax credit is not an accurate assumption by any means.

If we're going to talk about how we help seniors stay in their homes, then we have to talk about making direct grants to seniors so that they can put in a ramp, so that they can modify their bathrooms for accessibility. We have to talk about providing home care on an adequate basis so that those seniors who are largely healthy but becoming more frail can get help here and there to allow them to live in dignity, to live with some control of their home environment. Those things would make for much healthier homes, and it's those questions that we would like this government to address. It's those questions of affordability, it's those questions of health care that need to be addressed, along with a system that allows those seniors who don't have \$10,000 in cash to actually make the investments they need so that their homes are accessible and safe, so that they're protected from fall injuries.

Speaker, this government has made a very big deal about legislation stimulating \$800 million in home renovation activity and the creation of 10,500 jobs throughout the Ontario economy annually. However, there's no requirement in this bill that these supplies, these renovations, these modifications be sourced here in Ontario. So we may well be importing good-quality bathroom fittings from Italy, from the United States, from China—not bad places, but if we're going to create jobs here in Ontario, we need to be using this kind of spending bill to ensure that it's Ontario manufactured goods that are installed. That will have a substantial impact on manufacturing as well as construction here in Ontario.

If we are going to proceed with this kind of bill, I'd ask the government, when we go to committee, to bring forward the reports that we need to see on how many seniors would actually need something other than a tax credit, would actually need a direct grant. We need to know, now whether or not this program will be offered and the money will just simply sit in the treasury.

Speaker, as you may well be aware, this government, in its 2007 election platform, promised a dental care program for low-income children, low-income teenagers in this province, and the reality was that the restrictions in regulation were so tight that almost no one qualified for the care that had been promised. So person after person who desperately needed dental care was turned away, while at the same time the money that had been promised sat in the treasury. For the Liberal government, it was the perfect program: The money was promised and they got credit, but they didn't actually have to spend the cash.

It's a lot like the student fee rebate that was offered. During the last election, if you didn't read the fine print,

you didn't know that half or more of the students in this province in post-secondary education wouldn't qualify. I have to tell you, the students in my riding and, my guess, the students in Essex and Hamilton Mountain and in Timiskaming—they've found out, because they send us emails. They say, "Just a second. We were promised a 30% reduction. But we don't qualify? What? I'm an older student going back to school so that I have greater opportunity for employment in a very tough economy. Why don't I qualify?"

So the question I have in this bill as well is, is there going to be a real commitment by this government to ensure that the bill results in aid being given to those who the bill says need that aid? From recent history, I would assume, that there's a very good chance much of this money will simply stay in the treasury and not actually reach seniors, not actually result in homes being modified as they should be modified to ensure that people can stay in them safely and for extended periods.

Now, I think it would be useful for the government to bring forward their research on the low-income seniors who can't afford to actually do this work. But I'll give their researchers a bit of help. There are almost 100,000 low-income seniors in this province—100,000.

1550

The poverty rate amongst women age 65-plus is 7.25%, and for the men about 4.75%. That's a lot of people who will never receive any benefit from this bill—never receive any benefit. Do they not deserve to have the modifications to their homes so they don't break their hip falling on stairs? Do they not deserve the modifications so they can properly and without risk wash themselves? I don't see anything in this bill, and I fear that when the regulations are written, what is already fairly tight in terms of the number of people this bill helps—that those regulations will be tightened and tightened and tightened so that household after household is set aside, is forgotten, and all that is remembered is that this Liberal government passed a bill with a very nice name.

Speaker, no one can stand against or speak out against assistance for seniors. It makes sense to us. All that we in the NDP ask is that when assistance is given, it is real, it is effective, and it is available to all the seniors who need the help.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Comments and questions?

**Mr. Joe Dickson:** It's a pleasure to speak for two minutes on Bill 2, the healthy homes renovation tax credit. I was just thinking I could talk about the home renovations that my parents had to do with 10 children. Obviously, there were continual extensions on the house. But I think this is just a parallel situation to a corporation who may do any type of construction work or expansion in a business. The spinoffs when you do something like this are ongoing. The spinoffs to the local economy: Someone is going to do the work; someone is going to buy the goods; someone is going to deliver the goods to you; someone is probably going to hire an assistant. He

may have to subcontract certain work. That's more employment that is going to come from our very same community.

I can tell you, when I started my business, which would be—I might give away a hint; I might let you know that I could be a year older than John O'Toole. As a teenager, I started my business 51 years ago, and I can tell you that it's run by my family now so I'm not involved. But when staff hires someone for construction, there's a buzz about. People in the industry actually have employment. They hire other people and it creates additional jobs, albeit for not great lengths of time, but for short time frames. This is what this Legislature is about this term: It's jobs, jobs and jobs.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Mr. John O'Toole:** I listened closely to the member of the NDP party, and it is their duty to stand up for those people that are finding the economy difficult today, especially seniors. I think Premier McGuinty, in his deliberation here on this Bill 11, has once again decided to solve every problem by spending money.

I think he raised a very good point about who qualifies, and that's the real subtlety of this bill. There's a limitation on income and there's a limitation on the purpose, what it can be spent on. So it sounds good, but again, once you peel back the banana skin, you find out that there's a rotten banana inside.

Now, there's a fundamental thing, that all Ontarians should be treated fairly. What we think is, does it reduce the size and cost of government? We're sort of following the template by Don Drummond. Now, Premier McGuinty doesn't seem to get it. Just now, he isn't contrite enough about his inability to balance the books, or even look forward to do it. Does it reduce the size and cost of government? Does it contribute to the public sector—or the private sector, rather—job creation? Does it ensure accountability and value for money for the taxpayer?

On all three of those quite straightforward accountability mechanisms, it fails.

Now, the whole theme here is, he's picking again one group of citizens versus another. But if you look at Don Drummond's report, there's so much in there that's so mean-spirited—really, if you look at it. It seems to me that he's picking on seniors. The Ontario seniors' drug benefit is one example. They're going to give it with one side and take it away with the other side. They're going to charge children to go on school buses to go to school in the country.

At the end of the day, he has to take responsibility for the mess that Ontario is in. It's a shame that he won't stand up here and say what he's going to do to rectify things.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments? The member for Timiskaming—Cochrane.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's a pleasure to be able to speak today on the healthy homes renovation tax credit. One thing the government should

get a prize for is beautiful titles and not much behind them. I've learned that in my short time here. Somebody's really good at naming titles.

There are a lot of the things—we should be helping seniors stay in their homes, but this bill should be more focused. I heard the honourable member across the way say it's all about jobs, jobs, jobs, but I thought it's all about keeping seniors in their homes. If you're really going to keep seniors in their homes—and when I had my seniors call me, they asked about the particulars, and do you know what? If we raise the percentage that they get, you would have more people doing it and you'd be keeping more seniors in their homes. If that's the true purpose of this bill, the healthy homes renovation tax credit—again, a lovely name—we would raise the percentage and keep more seniors in their homes; or we would make a grant and keep even more seniors in their homes; or we would increase what qualified, because some of the seniors who call my office have a hard time paying their heating bill or have a hard time paying something otherwise and would love to have a walk-in shower, but they're more worried about keeping a roof over their head.

It would be great if this bill could be more focused and if the government could actually say, "We are focused on keeping seniors in their homes. We're not focused on nice titles and trying to create some jobs and maybe giving the more well-to-do seniors a tax break."

I would really hope that the government is really focused on keeping seniors in their homes and that we can work on this bill in the future.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments and questions?

**Mr. Bill Mauro:** What happened here?

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** I wasn't sure.

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Okay. The member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan.

**Mr. Bill Mauro:** Thank you, Speaker. I apologize to our member from Niagara. I thought I got grabbed by the whip here to do two minutes.

I'm happy to speak briefly on the healthy homes renovation tax credit. It's relevant because I can tell you that in my constituency office in Thunder Bay—Atikokan we are receiving calls from seniors who are very much interested in this, and it's an opportunity for me to remind people who might have been somewhat unsure or misled by some of the discussion in the Legislature that you don't have to spend \$10,000 to be able to tap into the program. Some people seem to be somehow under that impression. Of course, that's the maximum allowable per year, which would get you a full tax credit of \$1,500; \$10,000 is the maximum allowable. You don't have to spend \$10,000. You can spend a lesser amount. If you invested \$5,000 into eligible components of the program, then you'd be eligible for half the maximum credit, \$750. And if you were to invest \$1,000, then you'd get about \$150 on a tax credit.

It's a good program. It's one that we're proud of. I know, as I've said already, it's one that seniors in my riding of Thunder Bay—Atikokan are interested in taking up.

The example of the \$1,000 I'll use that will get you \$150 back is—there was a private member's bill introduced when we first came back after the election in the fall that was going to provide seniors and others with home heating relief. In the words of the person who brought the bill forward, that was going to only save people in the province of Ontario a maximum of \$100—about 27 cents a day. That was brought forward with great fanfare.

Here, we have a program that can help seniors stay in their own home, where they want to stay. It has the ability to actually leverage them more financial room—as I've said, up to \$1,500 year over year—as well as create jobs at the same time.

As I've said, in my riding of Thunder Bay—Atikokan this looks to be picking up some steam. Seniors are interested in this, and we know they want to stay in their own homes. It's a good program, and it's one that I support.

1600

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for Toronto—Danforth has two minutes to respond.

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** Well, thank you, Speaker. My thanks as well to the members from Ajax—Pickering, Durham, Timiskaming—Cochrane and Thunder Bay—Atikokan for their comments.

A few responses: one to the member for Ajax—Pickering, who may well have been in his very early teens when he started that business. If the government is interested in job creation, why is it that it ended the energy home retrofit program? That program was creating jobs, helping the environment. It was a positive contribution. I don't have anything against creating jobs through supporting construction; I think it's a good idea. I don't have anything against providing tax credits to seniors to make their homes accessible. What I have to ask is why it is that home energy savings programs have been cut and those jobs, and the loss of those jobs, has not been recognized by this government.

The member from Thunder Bay—Atikokan is quite correct: You don't have to spend \$10,000 to get a \$1,500 tax credit; it's just that what people hear most of the time is they'll get a credit of \$1,500. What they haven't heard is that you have to spend \$10,000 to get that much of a return. The reality is, of course, that the return and the tax credit depend on how much you put in. If you don't have \$5,000 or \$10,000, you aren't going to get a lot of money back.

Speaker, if we are concerned about keeping seniors in their homes there needs to be more than this tax credit. This tax credit, in and of itself, is not a bad thing. It's probably a good thing, but inadequate. What we need is a strategy for making sure that seniors have the support across the spectrum of health care affordability and accessibility.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. Further debate?

**Ms. Helena Jaczek:** It gives me great pleasure to rise today in support of Bill 2, the Healthy Homes Renovation Tax Credit Act. This is one of a number of initiatives that our government has taken in order to try and keep our seniors in their own homes for as long as is feasible.

Why is this so important? It's not only, of course, for the quality of life of those individuals, to stay in the home that they may have lived in for decades and where they are comfortable, but also we've shown that in fact it's much better for their health. Their health outcomes are better if in fact they are able to stay in such a situation. And, of course, there is the issue of cost as well, not only for individuals and their families as compared, for example, with going into a long-term-care facility or even a retirement home, but of course, the cost to the taxpayer is also important. In fact, the recent Drummond report made it very clear that whatever we can do in terms of community health care as opposed to institutional health care is going to be a cost savings.

Now, in my own riding of Oak Ridges–Markham, during the recent election, I had—obviously—the opportunity to knock on many, many doors. What I find so fascinating about that experience is that you never quite know who is going to come to the door and what the family makeup in that home actually is. In many parts of my riding, there are families with three generations living under one roof. This is often where newer Canadians have come, established themselves, are working long hours. They have children. The grandparents are in the home to assist with child care, meal preparation and so on, and it's absolutely vital to that family unit to in fact have those three generations living together. It's important in terms of preserving the culture from where they came, but it's also a very important and practical assistance to them to stay as that type of extended family unit in their own homes. So this bill will also help family members where they're sharing their home with a senior.

Some of the comments made by our friend from Toronto–Danforth relate to the need to stimulate those jobs in the economy through various tax credits. Again, the federal 2009 home renovation tax credit did show that there was a tremendous take-up from that tax credit. Again, during the election, wandering around my neighbourhood, I was able to talk to a number of small contractors, small businessmen who, in fact, had been contracted under that home renovation tax credit to provide some retrofits within homes in my riding. So there certainly are, as my colleague from Ajax–Pickering has said, some real spinoff benefits to the local economy from this type of tax credit.

Now, just to make sure everyone understands the details of the bill: If passed, this bill will be retroactive to October 2011. Certainly, I've taken every opportunity to remind seniors in my community, if they have made some renovations, to keep those tax receipts in anticipation of this bill passing in this House, which will clearly require some co-operation from the members of

the two opposition parties. I would certainly hope that we're going to see that type of co-operation that will assist our seniors.

The point has been very clearly made that this is a 15% tax credit of whatever the expenditure is. Some of the renovations may be relatively low-cost: things like grab bars; reinforcements around the toilet, bathtub and shower; handrails in corridors. These are pretty low-cost items, but 15% of whatever that cost is can certainly assist the seniors in question.

Some of the renovations, though, would potentially be considerably more expensive. When we're talking about things like stairlifts and ramps, those type of expenditures may very well be in the order of \$5,000 or \$6,000. But again, 15% of that is a substantial amount.

There are a number of really quite innovative eligible expenses, and I think the more people read and understand what is available to them in the home, the more the uptake will be: things like changing the knobs on door handles to levers, making it easier for seniors; the same thing with taps, for those arthritic hands, which may make life that much more comfortable and easier. All these types of renovations, in fact, are going to be eligible.

This particular bill is one of only many that this government has introduced. I'm really pleased to remind this House of some of these supports that we have provided for seniors since 2003. We have enhancements to energy and property tax credits for seniors. We've provided additional tax relief to some 740,000 seniors to help them with their energy costs and property taxes. Seniors can get a maximum credit of \$1,025 annually.

I don't think we should forget the types of cuts that we've made to personal income tax. On average, 93% of income tax payers are getting a personal income tax cut and are now saving some \$200 annually. Again, to the member for Toronto–Danforth, I'd like to remind him that some 90,000 Ontarians no longer pay any provincial income tax.

Other tax credits, such as the Ontario sales tax credit, have been of assistance. Seniors in the north who pay rent or property tax for their principal residence are eligible for an annual credit of up to \$130 for a single person and up to \$200 for a family.

In addition, we have the Ontario senior homeowners' property tax grant. Eligible seniors are going to continue to receive additional assistance with their property taxes through this grant, which started in 2009. The maximum grant was doubled to \$500 in 2010. This was announced back in 2008.

So what you're seeing, in fact, is a steady concentration on this very important issue.

I'd like to touch a little bit on what we've been doing in terms of aging at home and improving home care services. During the last couple of months, certainly in my constituency office, I've received a steady stream of stakeholders and constituents who have come to tell me about the situation, either for themselves or with their agency, so I was very interested to meet with Central

CCAC, the community care access centre, under the leadership of their CEO, Cathy Szabo. The Central CCAC actually has a very large population base that needs to be served—some 1.7 million—and in the year 2010-11 they served some 81,164 clients, and of those, some 58% were seniors.

1610

I was very interested in what they had to tell me about their Home First program, which was specifically designed to keep seniors in their own home following discharge from hospital. So instead of moving into a long-term-care facility, in the Home First program there is intensive case management for a period of some 90 days. The point of this particular intensive case management is to look at what an individual, a senior, might require in their own home in order to stay there.

So in addition to nursing visits, as you might expect, an occupational therapist or a physiotherapist will visit within three days of discharge from hospital. This is the type of trained health professional who can look at activities of daily living for their client and make the type of suggestions that would be eligible for this particular tax credit. Often, homeowners are really quite unaware of what they could do.

They've had tremendous success with this particular program and, in fact, looking back at the last year, they were able to ensure that some 70% of their clients were able to stay at home with regular home care services with the types of additions and assistance, including physical assistance, such as these home renovations that we're talking about today.

To me, it's quite clear that we need to pass Bill 2. I'm optimistic that we'll have support from all sides of the House in relation to this bill. I'm sure that your constituents, just like mine, will see it clearly as a benefit. Is there more to do? No question. But this particular piece of legislation is an important part of the puzzle.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Comments and questions?

**Mr. Rick Nicholls:** I'm choosing to address the proposed healthy homes renovation tax credit that should probably be renamed the wealthy home renovation tax credit: a 15% tax credit up to \$10,000. But my question is, how many seniors have that extra \$10,000 for home renovations just to get \$1,500 back?

Let's do the math. These same seniors will have to pay an additional 13% HST for a total of \$1,300. The net is now only \$200 and, with my math, that's not a very good ROI, return on investment. That's about a 2% return. I'm concerned that this is going to cost Ontario taxpayers considerable money.

What we have learned from the Liberal government is that they do not give one all of the necessary details to make informed decisions. I've yet to see what type of renovations actually qualify for this proposed bill.

My concerns are twofold. First of all, this bill could very definitely foster the underground economy. Secondly, as I look back, this is reminiscent of this government's election promise of reducing tuitions by

30%. Once elected, the students and parents actually found out the real rules, which have left many students without tuition relief.

Having said that, Madam Speaker, I do not support this wealthy home renovation tax credit.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments and questions? The member for Scarborough Southwest.

**Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to welcome you and everyone else back from our break, and comment for a few moments on the comments made by the member from Oak Ridges-Markham.

She spoke very thoroughly on the healthy homes renovation tax credit, and she touched on several good points. But I just want to focus on one thing that she said, and that is that when you go out into the riding and you talk to your business people and your residents, you realize what is really going on. There are a lot of seniors out there who need help, and when you actually go to their homes, you see they're installing items like wheelchair ramps and even a lot of things inside the house.

I went to one home and the person actually had installed a chair that goes from the ground floor and moves automatically to the second floor. They don't have to worry about walking up and down the stairs, especially if they have bad knees or bad hips.

This bill touches on one key point that I think is really important, and that is that it keeps seniors in their homes. I can't express how important that is. No one, no senior, really wants to move into a nursing home or other locations or institutions. They like to stay in their homes. This bill, among other things, allows seniors to stay in their homes, which is what they want to do. When you go into these homes, you see how well decorated or how well kept the home is, because that's their main asset. I think they want to stay in their homes.

I know my time is running low, and I will be speaking later on this afternoon—stay tuned—on this bill. Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments and questions?

**Mr. Steve Clark:** I want to take a moment during this debate of Bill 2 to talk about a meeting I had in my constituency office during the House recess with one of my constituents, Ron Stewart.

Speaker, you won't find a more hard-working, play-by-the-rules kind of guy than Ron, who operates a small business, Stewart Property Maintenance. He came to see me to talk about the HST, which has devastated his home service business over the last year and a half. It's a story I've heard far too many times since the McGuinty government brought in this hated tax in the midst of a severe economic downturn.

Ron's experience—his ongoing struggles to survive—really is a story of what's happening in Ontario today under Dalton McGuinty's watch. Ron talked about how the HST has made it more difficult for homeowners to afford his services, making it harder for him to earn a

living and to hire people to work in the riding. He falls above the \$30,000 threshold. Thanks to this government, he now has to charge an additional 13% on grass cutting, snow removal and housekeeping, vital services that are often overlooked when we talk about helping seniors stay in their home longer.

Ron spoke about Bill 2, the healthy homes renovation tax credit, and he shared a comment that I've heard so many times: "Where are these seniors—where does this government think seniors are going to have \$10,000 to spend? Are they really that out of touch?" And he suggested to me, and I think it's a good suggestion, that if we're going to be serious about keeping seniors in their home, we need to have those services like his business provides available.

It's unfortunate that the government didn't listen to folks like Ron Stewart when they put forward Bill 2. I can tell you, when we're debating the legislation today, I know that their piece of legislation isn't going to have the impact on seniors in this province.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Comments and questions?

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** It's a pleasure to be back and indeed an honour to speak to Bill 2, the healthy homes renovation tax credit.

Much has been made about the quite lengthy title. It is essentially offering some small measure of relief to seniors who find themselves in their homes, who wish to stay in their homes as they age and require some help with those services—grab bars and accessibility services. But what we're saying here on the left side of the House, on the New Democratic side of the House, is that it really doesn't go far enough.

1620

Ultimately, we know we have a crisis in this province and, arguably, across the country, when it comes to dealing with our aging demographic, particularly in my riding, in Windsor and Essex county. The member across the way from Windsor West would know the challenges that we face in long-term-care facilities, and some of the shortfalls that this government has made when it comes to funding and actually coming to the table with a plan that will address those needs. Thankfully, we're seeing some signs of hope in that area, but I know there are other regions in Ontario that continue to suffer.

We question the premise. We question the impact that this bill will have. We also look to other models in other jurisdictions, because there has to be someone who has done it better than this government is proposing to. We see a government in Quebec, as a matter of fact, that offers us a clear indication of how they've dealt with this issue. They've offered grants of up to \$3,500 that would definitely ease the burden for people looking to retrofit their homes.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for Oak Ridges–Markham has two minutes to respond.

**Ms. Helena Jaczek:** Thank you to the members for Chatham–Kent–Essex, Scarborough Southwest, Leeds–Grenville and Essex.

Certainly I heard from the NDP that this initiative perhaps isn't as large as they would like to see; they're talking about grants and so on. I would urge them to, in fact, review the Drummond report in perhaps a more comprehensive way. It's incredibly clear from that report that we are facing very, very sobering economic times. It's incumbent on our government to target programs specifically where we can to assist people, to move towards community health care, but we can't continue to just write blank cheques.

This is a balanced and very prudent approach. It's showing, I think, considerable leadership in our emphasis on keeping seniors at home.

In terms of the opposition, I think they're trying to tell us that this is a negligible amount, to a certain extent; I'm not quite sure what their solution would be.

I certainly know, from what I have heard from my seniors—and like, I'm sure, all of you, I've spent a lot of time out there in the community. I have heard nothing but positive remarks on this small piece of assistance to seniors for them to stay in their own homes. Along with the continued emphasis on Aging at Home strategies, where home care is to protect the frail elderly, preventing institutionalization, I think that we are going to see tremendous improvement in the health of our seniors over time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** The member mentioned that the Drummond report was something that we should take into consideration. I would mention to the member that the Drummond report is really a report card on the last eight years of spending beyond our abilities throughout Ontario in almost every area. As a report card on Ontario's fiscal responsibility, I'm afraid the Premier—the educational Premier for Ontario—has got an F in every situation. He has never seen an expenditure that he hasn't supported. He has never said no to anyone. And now we find ourselves in a situation in Ontario that is on a road to destruction of one of the greatest provinces in Canada in one of the greatest countries in the world. That's a huge indictment on how the McGuinty government has failed the people of Ontario.

Here we are, the first day back. As the member mentioned, we have this humongous problem facing us that Drummond has pointed out to us, and what are we debating? Are we debating the future of our province? Are we debating the real issues that Ontarians are concerned about, about the jobs they might not have in the future, about the careers that their children may not have in the future? Is that what we're debating today? No. No, I'm sad to say that we're debating a bill that will have a minimal effect on very few people in Ontario, Bill 2, the Healthy Homes Renovation Tax Credit Act.

There's a number of criteria associated with it, of course. One of the criteria is you have to be over 65 years of age before you can apply for it. I won't suggest that there might have been political implications in that, but they're 65 years old.

You must live in the home. It must be your permanent home. It can't be your second home; it can't be a cottage, for instance.

There is no income test, of course, for this, which is positive. It's available to owners and renters.

But the criteria that I like the best, the criteria that brings a smile to my face every time I read it, is that no improvement may increase the value of the property. So if you're going to renovate your bathroom, and you're going take out the tub, and you're going to put in a shower, which is easier for a senior to get in and out of, that might be a good thing. But be sure you hire a very mediocre plumber so that when you put in that shower, it looks terrible, and it won't increase the value of your home; otherwise, it doesn't qualify.

If you put a new shower in your bathroom, it's going to increase the value of your home. Then you would be disqualified from this program. So make sure when you put it in, it looks shoddy.

The member mentioned that you might change your taps from screw taps to lever taps, which is a very good point. But when you buy the new handles to put on your taps, make sure they don't match; that way it won't improve the value of your home.

**Mr. John O'Toole:** Now you've got to hire inspectors to figure this all out.

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** And, of course, as the member from Durham mentions, there will be the bureaucratic inspectors coming around to check to see if the value of this house has been improved. If you do a really nice job—

**Mr. John O'Toole:** You could end up owing them money.

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** —they'll pass it on to the municipal inspectors, and the value of your house will go up, and you'll pay more taxes on it.

Why would they put that into a bill? It's obviously there for political motivation. This government is far too concerned about political motivation and not concerned enough with Ontario's future, Ontario's jobs, the things that are going to create prosperity in the future. This government seems to routinely ignore those things.

The tax credit has been mentioned; it's 15% of up to a \$10,000 expenditure, so it's \$1,500 back. Of course, in order to obtain that or some portion of it, you're going to have to spend 13% in HST taxes, so the net cost of this to government, of course, is much reduced.

One thing that confused me: The member from Thunder Bay–Atikokan in his two-minute comment mentioned that this credit would be good year over year. I don't know whether a senior can apply for it this year, they can apply for it again next year, and they can apply for it, I guess, for a third year. That isn't mentioned in the bill, but the member quite likely might know something about how the government is going to implement this; we don't see what the regulations might bring.

They estimate this bill will be costing about \$60 million in this fiscal year this year and next year. From the date of introduction to March 31, 2013, it will cost

\$60 million. You know, since being re-elected, this government has increased spending by \$2.5 billion through bills like this—\$2.5 billion. Drummond says that we're in terrible financial straits, and yet this government continues to spend. It continues this out-of-control spending that it's had for the past eight or nine years.

**Mr. John O'Toole:** They're addicted. They have an addiction problem.

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** It's an addiction that I don't believe that this government can change, and that makes for a very sad day for Ontario and our future.

**1630**

Our debt, which is currently just about \$240 billion—Drummond says it will be in excess of \$400 billion if nothing is done. That debt puts us on the road to, if not at, the situation that Greece finds itself in today.

There's nothing that guarantees that a province or a city is going to continue to grow. There's nothing mandated that says Ontario will continue to prosper down the road. It's good fiscal management by its provincial government and by its municipal governments that creates that opportunity for growth.

When I was growing up in the early 1960s, Buffalo, New York, and Toronto were both about a million in population. Through good management, provincially and municipally, Toronto continued to grow. Today it's 2.5 million people. Buffalo, which was a million people at the same time, is today about half a million people. Half the population of Buffalo have moved out because they didn't have the kind of responsible government that we've had in Ontario.

And this government isn't continuing that responsible government. This government is continuing spendthrift ways that are leading us down a path of destruction. They continue to borrow money from future taxpayers, and they're borrowing that money from future taxpayers without the future taxpayers' permission. In any other place in our society, when you take money from someone without their permission, it's called robbery, it's called stealing, and you go to jail for it. This government is doing exactly that. It's borrowing money from future taxpayers without those taxpayers' permission. It's a disgusting thing to do, and this government should give serious thought as to how it is conducting the business of this province.

This bill will not help seniors. As was pointed out by the member from Danforth, it will help a very select few; it won't help many. And our seniors deserve so much better. They built this province into the pinnacle of the shining city on the hill. People from around the world flocked here. They are no longer flocking. They are coming slowly but at a much slower rate than they did in the past. They're going to other parts of Canada where there is much more opportunity for them than there is in the province of Ontario. It is such a sad day to watch this province float down that road, which has a very sad ending to it.

I think there's a way in which we can turn Ontario around. I think there's a way in which we can control our

spending. I think there's a way in which we can build business in this province. Building business is the important part of it, because every time you create a new job, you create a new taxpayer, and that makes the paying down of debt easier. This government has to move down that road with all possible haste and, sadly, I don't think you have the intestinal fortitude to—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. Questions and comments?

**Miss Monique Taylor:** Madam Speaker, I'm happy to speak to this bill also, because in Hamilton Mountain I spoke with many seniors during the campaign, and it wasn't about how they're going to spend the extra money in their pockets. It really, truly was about how they're going to stay in their homes.

But during our campaign platform, we were putting forth initiatives such as helping seniors with snow shovelling, cutting the grass, getting groceries into their homes, making sure that they had people there who were going to be able to help them clean their house, with extra initiatives on top of that. That's great, because I know that they can use hand pulls helping them and assisting them with those kinds of devices, but it's just truly not enough.

We need to make sure that we are there assisting them daily, daily, daily. They don't want to be in long-term-care facilities, Madam Speaker; they want to be in their homes, but that's going to take more than a 15% tax break by a lot of seniors who I know in my constituency just can't afford it. They're more worried about their pensions and about how they're going to be able to pay for their prescriptions than they are a handrail for their bathroom. These are the kinds of things that we need to make sure that we're looking at.

I agree: The Drummond report says that we need to make cuts. Well, we need to make sure that we're spending money in the right directions, to make sure that it counts at the end of the day, not just throwing frivolous things on the table to make it look good, with a great name tied to it.

Thank you for your time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Comments and questions?

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** I was pleased to see this bill come into the Legislature.

I participated in the federal program that was on in 2009-10 and made improvements to my home from an energy point of view—and also a new roof. That was a program that you didn't have to spend the big dollars on. You could do whatever you needed with the house. That was a successful program. It created employment, and people were able to make a lot of renovations to their homes.

This would be retroactive, I think, to October 2011, if the bill passes.

I keep in good touch with seniors in the seniors' groups in Orléans. We've got about 3,000 seniors, in four groups, who are trying to be active. The province gives, I think, \$80 per senior in those groups to help them stay

healthier, help them with exercise, the diets and other information they give to them. Certainly, these programs are good. This is another program that will just help a few more seniors stay in their homes. Aging at home is one of the—I think it was a \$1.1-billion program when it was introduced. Aging at home is extremely important. This will help.

I'd just like to read from the Drummond report: "Spending is neither out of control nor wildly excessive. Ontario runs one of the lowest-cost provincial governments in Canada relative to its GDP and has done so for decades. And we must recognize that some important steps have been taken in the past few years to help manage costs, improve our prospects for future economic growth and enhance services to the public."

I think this is part of the ongoing legislation that will help seniors in our province.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. Further comments?

**Mr. Bill Walker:** I'm pleased to speak in regard to the Drummond report, like my esteemed colleague from Halton and my colleague from across the way from Ottawa-Orléans. It's a report card that's a failing grade, a major F; a \$16-billion deficit.

Mr. Chudleigh made a comment that Dalton has never said no to anyone, and I would suggest that he said no to the people of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound with the Green Energy Act, he said no to the people of rural Ontario with the whole Green Energy Act, and he continues to say no to the people of Ontario because of his inaction to make decisions that are going to bring this province back to where it should be. He also made a comment that one of the criteria was that no improvement shall increase the value. Well, I'm starting to now see the understanding of how they implemented their Green Energy Act, because there is definitely no value with the improvements that they supposedly are making.

I find it interesting that they bring a 15% supposed increase to seniors, although they leave out that their hydro bill is going to go up 46%. My mom, who lives in her own home on a very fixed income, is struggling with how she's going to make that 15% decrease pay off for the 46% increase. The math, just as you said in the Drummond report, does not add up.

I'm concerned about the billion-dollar boondoggle with that gas plant in Mississauga. Just think what we could have done for seniors, if we really wanted to help people stay in their homes, with that \$1 billion that has now gone to naught—a waste of money, a waste of time, a waste of energy.

I'm fully supportive of keeping people in their homes, and so are my constituents in Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound. We definitely want that to happen, but we need good plans in place that are going to allow that. It's great to have new door handles and new grab bars, but if they can't afford to stay in their homes, it's not going to do them much good.

Bill 2 is indicative of Liberal governance: Talk about grab bars and doorknobs instead of about job plans and

deficit reduction. We need this government to stand up and be accountable and do the right actions.

1640

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments and questions?

The member for Halton has two minutes respond.

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I'd like to thank the member for Hamilton Mountain.

To the member for Ottawa-Orléans, I'd like to thank him for his comments. I see that he was at the trough of the federal program, and that doesn't surprise me.

The member for Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound, of course, made some very good points in that the hydro costs are going to suck up any savings that the seniors might recognize under this program. The cost of health care is going to continue to increase. The costs of the municipal taxes are going to continue to increase, because they keep experiencing new costs because of the programs this government puts in place.

**Mr. John O'Toole:** New taxes.

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** And the new taxes that this government brings in or fees that they bring in are going to suck up all those savings as well.

So the results of this bill are going to have a very negative impact on seniors across the province, and there isn't a more vulnerable or more deserving group of people that need help from the uncontrolled cost increases that this government keeps foisting on them.

It's a shame that this government continues to treat seniors in such a shabby way. It's disappointing. We're seeing seniors that are struggling to stay in their homes, struggling to stay above water as far as their costs are concerned, and it happens, it gets worse and worse, every year. Now to bring in a bill like this which is not really going to help very many of them or help them to any great extent while we have the unbelievable fiscal problems of this province is a diversion tactic. It's sad that the province has come to this, and it would be—thank you, Madam Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member from Essex.

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Just actually reflecting back on the beginning of the session, the prior session, the winter session, post the October election, and what has transpired since, now we have this transformative Drummond report, the "What would Drummond do?" report, WWDD. What would Dwight Duncan do; that's what I want to know, not what Don Drummond would do.

But, you know, what surprises me is the work that potentially could have gotten done in between our sessions. They've got 362 recommendations out of Drummond. They squeezed 362: 362 at \$1,500 a day. So that's like a recommendation a day for a year.

But yet we couldn't even strike committees. They couldn't understand that they were in a minority situation and that the balance of power is no longer on that side of the House. So that's one decision, one realization, that they couldn't come to. It's right here with us.

*Applause.*

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** And my colleague is happy about that. There's one challenge that we've overcome. Now are you saying to us that we have 362 more challenges to overcome? Because I highly doubt that we will get through them.

So the question is, what is this trial balloon, potentially the largest trial balloon that we have seen? Is it a bait and switch? Is it the biggest, most classic example of that? What I think it is is a government that's out of ideas and has to outsource their ideas, like they do many other of their operations. Maybe they should create a department of ideas and bring in the brain trust there, because evidently there aren't any internally on that side.

What we're saying is that this idea here lacks substantially in addressing the true issue: that seniors, and particularly low-income seniors, need help. They don't need a token. They don't need a Band-Aid. They need real solutions to address the issues.

Those ideas typically come from this quadrant of the House, from the New Democratic side. I can hearken back to our good friend Roy Romanow, who sounded the alarm on our looming crisis and how it was important for to us deal with an Aging at Home strategy and a long-term-care strategy, to be putting money into that, that it was a good investment and that it was going to save you money in the future on your health care rolls. But those recommendations weren't heeded by the federal government at the time; nor do they seem to be picked up in any tangible measure by any government until the crisis is on the front doorstep.

We're talking about the stability, viability and security of our seniors, those who built this province, those who worked each and every day, paid their taxes, played by the rules, raised families, had small businesses, ran farms—the cornerstone of this province. What do we give them in return? What do we have to offer them? Potentially, if they spring \$10,000 on any home renovations, with some serious caveats attached, we can give them a \$1,500 tax break.

Well, it's clearly inadequate when your typical bathtub renovation is going to put somebody out \$3,000 or \$4,000, and ramping accessibility into a home, if someone requires a graded ramp, is another \$3,000 or \$4,000. These are substantial investments, at the same time we hear that our federal government's looking to reduce support mechanisms through the OAS. So there are signals out there. All levels of government are saying, "Hey, thank you for your contribution. We hope you had fun, but we're gone. We're out of the game when it comes to support. We no longer feel as though we have any responsibility to provide some assurances to you."

That's sort of the broader scope of things. I'll go back to the Drummond report and its overall message of fiscal doom and gloom, financial gloom and doom and economic uncertainty. That's sort of the name of the game these days in a globalized, privatized, deregulated, militarized—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** —consumerized, corporatized environment.

But, Madam Speaker, it's easy to make those assumptions, that it is strictly due to gross negligence from the public sector. What it's actually saying, what I think the interpretation is, is that this government doesn't believe or Don Drummond doesn't believe that Ontarians have the gumption to build their economy, to work, to be productive.

Come down to southwestern Ontario. Come to my riding and meet some of the farmers there, meet some of the folks who have been in the trades, the tool and die industry, that made the motor run, our economic engine—literally putting them together on assembly lines. Tell those people that they don't have the ability. Tell them that you don't believe in them. That's what the Drummond report is actually saying. It's saying that times are never going to get better.

And Drummond points out—I saw Steve Paikin in the gallery today. Drummond let slip—this is important for the members across the way to understand and to listen to. Drummond acknowledged that the reason that we will not return to any measure of certainty is because of the measures that were taken away through tariff protection. Don Drummond mentions right there on Steve Paikin's Agenda that the auto pact offered some measures of assurance for our manufacturing sector, which said, "If you want to sell it here, you've got to build it here."

But we're in a province nowadays where, you know—well, it's Caterpillar corporatism. It's vulture capitalists that are swirling around, looking at our heartland and swirling around the heartland of our manufacturing sector, knowing that we've built our industry with good, solid technology, workers that are productive, ready to come in, feed off of that intelligence, feed off of that good red meat, and then take it out of our jurisdiction. What do we do as a province? We entice them with corporate tax cuts: more, bigger cut, more corporate tax cuts, without any regard if they stay or not.

1650

My colleague across the way says that they're taking a measured approach with this particular bill in regard to healthy homes and that's why it's not so expansive. Wouldn't we wish that they took that approach when it came time to addressing corporate tax cuts and be strategic about it? I'm all supportive of helping businesses plant their roots here and helping entice investment, but ensure—can't you get it in writing that they're going to stay here for a while? That would seem prudent to me, and I know it seems prudent to those in my riding who are looking at the way that we spend our money here. A corporate tax cut is an expenditure, and we're saying to be prudent with it and have a keen mind on where you're giving our money away, because if those returns aren't going to be made, if those investments aren't going to be here in this province, then don't make them in the first place. Don't take the broad, across-the-board tax cut agenda that has failed us so far in so many ways.

We have serious reservations about the overall perspective of where this government is heading and its approach to providing security, providing safety,

particularly for seniors. We think this bill is really the least they could do. It is. It's the very least they could do.

A more pragmatic approach would be to do what Quebec has done, a jurisdiction that provides us with possibly a more progressive way to deal with supporting our seniors who require assistance and assisted living and assistive devices in their homes. They acknowledge that the lowest-income seniors require the most help and therefore they get a \$3,500 tax break, with the caveat that they have to hire skilled local tradespeople to do that. So they've already attached—there's the carrot and the stick there, and it's an approach that actually makes sense. Here you're saying that you've got to spring \$10,000 to get the maximum benefit out of this. And who does have \$10,000? These days, we know that it's slim to none.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Comments and questions?

**Mr. Joe Dickson:** It's a pleasure to stand on Bill 2, the healthy homes renovation tax credit. I'd like to just read clearly one of Mr. Drummond's statements in the executive summary: "Yet spending is neither out of control nor wildly excessive. Ontario runs one of the lowest-cost provincial governments in Canada relative to its GDP and has done so for decades."

I'd like to comment on some of the other quotations today. Actually, they're all very positive and they're very strong. The honourable member for Toronto—Danforth indicated, and I quote, "I don't have any problem creating jobs through ... construction." I agree with the honourable member: That's right and that's a spinoff of this seniors' bill, and we both agree with that, especially getting more trades out to work as quickly as we can.

Also, if I may, the honourable member from Essex may not be aware, but the figure for Mr. Drummond was not \$150,000; it was, in fact, half of that. He slashed his bill in half. I think someone in the press apologized for printing that information. Any saving is a welcome saving, and we thank Mr. Drummond for that.

Actually, the home of my parents and of many brothers and sisters—Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound particularly talked about jobs as a spinoff of this Bill 2, healthy homes, and I can tell you it's also very positive. It's so nice when you win with the bill and win with an additional spinoff.

The honourable member for Timiskaming—Cochrane—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. Further comments?

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I want to make comments as well on the member for Algoma-Manitoulin's comments, which I thank him for.

I too have done—

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Essex.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** I thought he was Algoma-Manitoulin. He looks like the member from Algoma-Manitoulin.

**Interjection:** No, it's Essex.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** I too have done the math, Speaker, and I find that this bill is really for a very small and select group of people.

The member before me spoke about the—I think he called it the wealthy home tax credit bill, as opposed to the healthy home tax credit bill, and I have to say that I agree with his comment. With our aging population, I think we can all agree that something must be done to support our seniors and to alleviate the financial stress that they have, especially the stress caused by their high energy bill. That said, the way it currently stands, this bill benefits a very small percentage of seniors with significant money in the bank for renovations.

My fellow member has also talked about the tax being \$1,300 on that \$10,000 for a rebate of \$1,500. I find that the comments that I heard over the 10-week break that we've had were not supportive of this.

I thank you for the time to speak on that, Madam Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** Thank you, Speaker.

I rise to thank the member for Essex for having taken on this issue. I felt that in his remarks he talked comprehensively about the challenges that we're facing. It isn't just a question of inadequate support for our seniors; it's also a question of inadequate protection for the industry, the manufacturing, the jobs that our wealth depends on.

These are all integrated questions. If we allow foreign corporations to buy up Canadian companies and shut them down so that they don't have competitors against their home plants in the United States, then of course the money available for actually providing our seniors with health care, with support in their homes, with home renovation grants—that money's not there. A failure to actually take on those big-picture economic issues means, in the end, that we don't have the resources that we need.

It's unfortunate that that's the case. Caterpillar is a very powerful example of companies buying up resources—Canadian assets—solely to move jobs out of this country, out of this province, to another jurisdiction, impoverishing this province.

My colleague talked about the Drummond report. I think it's very important that people look at the Drummond report not only because occasionally one finds useful elements, but also because in many, many areas, the Drummond report didn't speak to real efficiencies but instead spoke to some of the—what can I say?—treasured beliefs of the Liberal government and tried to reinforce them, not actually improving our fiscal situation but providing that government with some sort of economic cover for a cuts budget that we expect to see soon.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Mrs. Laura Albanese:** It is my pleasure to speak in regard to the healthy homes renovation tax credit.

I want to point out that this proposed bill would not only help seniors who live in their own homes—homeowners and tenants—but also will help families who have a senior living with them. Seniors and their families would be allowed to claim a refundable tax credit, as you know, of up to \$1,500 for expenses that are related to permanent modifications to their homes. But I want to make it clear that they do not have to spend the whole \$10,000. Sometimes it seems from the opposition we hear that you have to spend \$10,000. You could spend less; you can spend whatever amount you need to spend.

1700

I want to point out that for family members who share a home with a senior relative, this would be a great benefit. They would also be able to claim the proposed credit. This would be used, for example, to allow for a first-floor occupancy or a granny flat or an in-law suite. That would be very important. I know a lot of people in my riding, I know families, that have a senior living in their home, and this would make a great difference in favour of the senior.

We want to support seniors that are living at home and free up the health resources for those patients that are occupying those costly beds in the hospitals, but we will also have to think of the fact that if they're cared for by their family in their own homes, that is even better for the senior. This will also create jobs. We were talking about jobs just a few minutes ago. It will create over 10,500 jobs and support about \$800 million—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. The member for Essex has two minutes to respond.

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank all of the members who added their voices to today's debate and to my 10-minute intervention.

I think it's clear that both sides of this House feel that this bill is inadequate, and there are other models, other ways, and other issues, other problems, that this government is not dealing with, not focusing on. What I think and what I believe is that this bill essentially started with the title—"What can we put out there? What can we brand and how can we market it?"—rather than actually starting with the problem, which is that more and more seniors in this province are finding themselves at an age, post-retirement, frail, with physical disabilities, without the adequate resources and security and backstop to be able to live in dignity and with the respect they deserve. It speaks to the larger issue of the prosperity of this province and the direction of this province where our seniors aren't guaranteed—and I know that there are no guarantees in life, but you would expect that after 30 years or 40 years in a laborious job and employment, you could build enough of a safeguard to be able to make those expenditures and afford to live in a decent state of life.

What's unfortunate is that I believe that this bill will fall short for more and more seniors in this province. We

have a government that just will not recognize that and won't come to the table with tangible measures to address it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Ms. Soo Wong:** I rise here to support Bill 2, the Healthy Homes Renovation Tax Credit Act. The Ontario government has made a commitment to programs that address the needs of Ontario families and strengthen the economy. The healthy homes renovation tax credit is a strong example of this commitment. If passed, the tax credit will help seniors stay at home longer, it will help family members that share a home with a senior, and it will benefit taxpayers by lessening the pressures on long-term-care home costs.

The tax credit will also benefit our economy by supporting over 10,500 jobs per year and by generating over \$800 million in home renovation activity. It is clear that Ontarians want programs that will relieve the burdens on senior homeowners and tenants. If the interest in the program is similar to the federal 2009 home renovation tax credit, up to 380,000 Ontarians would benefit from this tax credit this year. The tax credit program will relieve the burdens of our seniors, who will be able to claim up to \$1,500 for expenses related to modifications of their homes. These modifications include renovations that are essential to the safety and well-being of our seniors, including grab bars and reinforcements around the toilet, bathtub and shower areas, as well as pull-out shelves that enable seniors to work from a seated position.

As a former nurse on the front line, I know the importance of living at home. This renovation tax credit will ensure reduction of falls, which is a leading cause of death among seniors, Madam Speaker. These modifications will help our seniors stay at home independently longer.

For seniors living in a home in Scarborough-Agincourt, the benefits of this tax credit are very clear. Many seniors have difficulty getting up the stairs in two-storey homes. The cost of purchasing and installing a stair lift can range in the area of \$6,000. If passed, the seniors claiming this expense under the home renovation tax credit will be able to recover about \$900 off the cost of the renovations.

The tax credits will also make a difference in the lives of our seniors. Over the past nine weeks, I had the pleasure of meeting with hundreds of seniors living independently in my riding of Scarborough-Agincourt. I met with seniors at Shepherd Village community of seniors, St. Paul's L'Amoreaux seniors' centre and Mon Sheong Court. In my discussions with these seniors, I found unanimous support of the government's proposed home renovation tax credits for seniors. Furthermore, not one single senior expressed interest in living in a long-term-care facility, even though a number of them are well over 80 years of age and have various health care needs.

As a former front-line registered nurse, I believe that we owe our seniors the opportunity to stay healthy and to

live with dignity and independence in the comfort of their own residence as long as they choose. The government of Ontario is working hard to ensure long-term-care facilities are not the only options we offer our seniors.

In a 2008 policy brief for the World Health Organization, Peter Coyte, a professor in the department of health policy at the University of Toronto, and his two colleagues argued for the appropriate balance between institutionalized care and less intensive forms of care. The author wrote, "When an older person needs little care, providing care in their own home is probably more likely to enhance their health and well-being, and at less cost, than equivalent institutional care."

The author also noted that "integrated community-based care needs to move away from an overly acute" care, like hospitals, or institutional care, like nursing homes, and focus on "one that embraces managing and coordinating both the long-term-care needs and chronic illness of older people."

According to the research at the University of Ottawa, Canada admitted a higher proportion of the elderly population to institutionalized care than any other industrialized country. The 2009 Special Senate Committee on Aging final report on Canada's aging population stated that "home care and home support is what Canadians want when their health makes it difficult for them to manage the activities of daily life."

Given these findings, the McGuinty government's proposed tax credit ensures that seniors in Ontario will be able to spend their old age living healthy and independently in the comfort of their own home and familiar surroundings. The large increase in the number of seniors in our province, the predominance of women and the significant increase in older seniors mean that we must support an initiative that provides seniors with a variety of housing options, including this tax credit, which will help seniors continue to live independently in their own homes. The Ministry of Finance has projected that over four million, or 23.4% of the population of Ontario, will be seniors aged 65 and over by 2036.

The home renovation tax credit is exactly the kind of forward-thinking program we need. The tax credit is projected to cost about \$60 million in 2011-12 and will be fully offset by redirecting existing expenditures from the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade and the Ministry of Revenue. It will also save them money in the future by lowering the burden on long-term-care costs as our province's population ages.

Finally, it's also important to know that this government has a strong track record of supporting Ontario's seniors. Since 2003, the McGuinty government has initiated a number of programs that make a difference in the lives of seniors across this province:

The enhancement of energy and property tax credits for seniors is providing additional tax relief for 740,000 seniors to help them with their energy costs and property taxes. These seniors can get a maximum credit of \$1,025 annually;

Personal income tax—better known as PIT—cut costs. On average, 93% of income taxpayers getting personal

income tax cuts save about \$200 annually. Also, 90,000 Ontarians no longer pay provincial income tax.

1710

The Ontario sales tax credit provides an annual payment of up to \$200 for every senior, in addition to the existing GST credit.

The Ontario senior homeowners' property tax grant allows that eligible senior homeowners will continue to receive additional assistance with their property taxes through the Ontario senior homeowners' property tax grant. The government is providing \$1 billion over the next five years through this grant to more than 600,000 seniors with low to middle incomes who own their own homes.

Generic drugs: The government of Ontario reformed Ontario's drug system to facilitate lower generic drug costs, benefiting all Ontarians, especially our seniors.

Pensions and retirement income security: Ontario is leading the way in a national effort to review the state of the current retirement income system.

So, Madam Speaker, this particular proposed legislation is moving us forward together, and I want to conclude my remarks by saying that Ontario seniors have made significant contributions to this province in terms of the building of this province to where it is today. We have a duty to champion, to advocate for programs and services our seniors need and want.

More importantly, the proposed healthy homes renovation tax credit is an evidence-based program that is budgeted for 2011 and 2012. It will also stimulate the economy and job creation. That's the focus of this McGuinty government, and I ask each one of us, as colleagues in the House, to support this bill and to support Ontario's seniors.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Rob Leone:** I'm pleased to stand here to talk about the healthy homes renovation tax credit. I'd like to thank the member from Scarborough—Agincourt for her comments. I also note that something I didn't know about the member is that she's a nurse. I think all of us know in the province of Ontario that we are in a period of time where we have to make some tough choices—tough choices between various spending initiatives.

So the question I have for the member is—this tax credit is going to cost hundreds of millions of dollars. It's going to benefit some seniors, and certainly comments on this side of the House suggest that the seniors who are going to benefit are those who are wealthy. Are we better off making some tough choices, spending hundreds of millions of dollars on hiring more nurses, the profession that that member was at? That's the question I would ask her. And what helps seniors more, hiring more nurses or producing a tax credit of the nature that we are talking about here?

I don't really understand also why we're actually talking about such things in this House. I know it's a government bill and we're talking about all these things, but we just had a report last week, the Drummond report,

that outlined in great detail the fiscal situation, the fiscal crisis that this province is in. It's a \$16-billion deficit. If things stayed according to plan, we'd have a \$30-billion deficit by 2017-18. Why are we here talking about a bill in this House that simply asks to us spend even more money? Are we simply here talking about a bill that will get us to that \$30-billion deficit even faster?

I have a lot of questions about that, Madam Speaker, and I hope the member opposite and all members who are contributing to this debate focus on those questions.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** It's a pleasure to respond to the member from Scarborough—Agincourt and to add to the comments of the member from Cambridge.

It's all nice for to us talk in this House about seniors, but I have a few questions because, yes, the healthy homes tax credit is going to help some, but what about the others? What about the seniors who can't afford not to fix up the bathroom but can't afford to stay in their house, the ones like some of them in my riding right now? Mining companies went broke on purpose to defraud the pension plan. They have no pension. They have no place to go. The wait is five years to get into a seniors' home in some of my towns. What are those people going to do now?

It's nice for to us to talk. It's also nice for us to talk about the Drummond report and all those recommendations. But to those seniors who are having to choose between electricity or food, you know what? They really don't care about the Drummond report, and they are here in this province. They are here in my riding; I'm sure they're here in other ridings. I'm sure all of the members—I know we all knock on doors, and I am sure we have all met them, people who have worked hard and who society has passed by. We should really be talking about what we are going to do to help those people.

We can all posture on both sides of the House, and we have forward-thinking programs. Well, let's do some forward thinking about those people because I'm sure we have them in all of our ridings. What are we going to do when they call me, and they're crying on the phone, "Where am I going to go?" I'm not going to tell them that they have to buy grab bars because that's not their problem.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** It's a pleasure to join the debate and to pass comments on the excellent comments that were made by my colleague the member from Scarborough—Agincourt on Bill 2, which I think all members of the House would agree is a practical piece of legislation.

We've all got people in our own ridings and communities that are aging. We have families who have aging members in those families. We have parents that are aging, and we have children, and we have grandchildren who want to assist in some way. Quite often, what that means is a change where the older person, the

older member of the community, will move in with their family, will move in with the children, will move in sometimes even with the grandchildren. Quite often what that means is that the house has to change a little bit. Quite often, along the aging process, there's been some changes in the mobility, perhaps, of the person involved.

This, to me, seems to be the sort of a bill that, in a very practical way, allows seniors that choose to stay in their own home, allows them the ability to help themselves, to change their own home, to put in something like a wheelchair ramp, for example, or a lift, or to lower the counters or to put in things like motion-activated lighting. All those changes that take place to all of us as we age can be accommodated if we make some of the changes that are envisioned by this bill.

But it also helps—as I said earlier, quite often families, and different cultures I think have different approaches to this, but quite often families have different approaches to how they look after the elders in their own society, and quite often the families themselves play an active role and will invite the parent back into their house. This allows, in a very practical way, for the government to assist those families in being able to look after the needs of the people who probably raised them in first place.

So I'd urge all members to support this bill. It's practical, it's well thought out, it's going to create jobs, and it's going pump about \$800 million back into the economy.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments or questions? The member from Nipissing-Pembroke-Renfrew.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke, a lovely place, and I know you've visited there, Speaker. I saw you in Petawawa one time at a great show there, and I'm sure you'll never forget Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke. I certainly never will forget your visit there.

Look, we're talking about the healthy homes renovation tax credit here. This is just another example of how this failed government has done its business for the past almost nine years. It never bases anything on what is sound policy or good government. It bases everything on "What political game can we win today? What political group, what demographic group can we satisfy in order to further our political agenda and our electoral chances the next time we go to the polls?"

I'll tell you, Speaker, that is one sorry way to do your business. And what has it gotten us? This is an example of it. What has it gotten us after nine years of Dalton McGuinty's failed government here in Ontario?

Well, we only have to ask ourselves, what happened last Wednesday? We got a rude awakening from the government's hand-picked analyst Don Drummond. When asked, "What do we need to do to balance the books in this province by 2017-18?", the prescription was heavy. It basically said, "You've done it all wrong. You've created the master of messes, the mother of all

messes, and now you turn to Don Drummond to try to fix it."

**1720**

Folks, it is Dalton McGuinty's mess, and this is just more politicization to try to take the heat off what is a failed government. It's time for them to pack it in.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. The member from—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Order. The member for Scarborough-Agincourt has two minutes to respond.

**Ms. Soo Wong:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank the members from Cambridge, Nipissing, Cochrane, Oakville, and Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke for your comments.

Let me remind the members opposite what they really read, okay? On page 22 of the executive summary of the Drummond report, it very clearly states, "All patients not requiring acute care should be diverted from hospitals to more appropriate care that will be less expensive"—less expensive, Madam Speaker—"improve the patient experience and reduce the patient's exposure to new health care risks.... Home-based care should be used more extensively." That's what this proposed legislation is all about. So unless the opposite member read the wrong Drummond report—then we could talk, okay?

We also know that the Ministry of Finance stated that by 2017, for the first time seniors will account for a larger share of the population than children aged zero to 14. Given these statistics, the government is doing the right thing. So I want to ask the member opposite, are you doing the right thing? Ontario seniors need to live, healthy and independent, in the community. The proposed legislation focuses not only on Ontario seniors but also their well-being and job creation. That's what the McGuinty government's about, okay?

So unless you read the wrong report—you have a right to criticize it, but we need to be here to champion our seniors because they have built this Ontario. We will continue to build this Ontario for a better Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. Further debate?

**Mr. Michael Harris:** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to respond to Bill 2, or, as the government likes to call it, the Healthy Homes Renovation Tax Credit Act. When you say that name, it sounds pretty good. It uses some of the right words: "Healthy," "Credit" and "Act." This government has gotten very good at naming things to make them sound better or to hide what they're really doing.

Take, for example, the legislation that gave us the HST. Back then, the Liberals called it the Ontario Tax Plan for More Jobs and Growth Act. The name sounded great; the reality, unfortunately, not so much.

Bill 2 also says one thing but means another. The name suggests that anyone can qualify for a tax credit to renovate their home. That couldn't be further from the truth. The bill, as written, applies only to seniors over the

age of 65 who can afford to spend \$10,000 on very specific types of renovations.

During the election, people in my riding of Kitchener-Conestoga told me time and time again that the cost of living in Ontario is becoming unaffordable. It's harder to make ends meet. They were vocal about the dramatic hydro rate increases over the past several years. They're alarmed at the prospect of an additional 46% increase over the next five years.

From Baden to Breslau, Kitchener to Elmira, everywhere I went, people expressed their dissatisfaction with Ontario's insurance rates, which are the highest in Canada. They were dismayed that despite promised tax increases for health care, services like eye exams, chiropractic and physiotherapy services—preventive care—are being removed from OHIP coverage.

As the MPP for Kitchener-Conestoga, every day I receive letters, emails, phone calls and even messages through social media telling me the government needs to focus on priorities like job creation and getting government spending under control.

Folks in my riding are asking for help dealing with problems with the WSIB. They are asking for help protecting their right to choose the day care provider they feel is most appropriate for their children. They want a say in what happens in their own communities when it comes to the placement of wind turbines—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Michael Harris:**—like my colleague here from Prince Edward-Hastings, and biogas plants, among other things.

They're not asking for new government programs that cater to a very small niche. They don't believe that when government gets bigger, it becomes more helpful—in fact, very much the opposite.

People in Kitchener-Conestoga, as in the case of the other 12 ridings the Liberals lost in October's election—some of my colleagues are here today because of it—see a much greater benefit in programs that benefit the majority of Ontarians, like removing the HST from home heating and hydro bills. They'd rather be given a break on their day-to-day expenses than be sold on a government scheme that ignores those who need help the most while giving a break to a small percentage that don't need it.

The opposition parties don't always agree, but one thing we do agree on is the need for broad-based relief for Ontario families, not the very, very narrow relief proposed by this bill.

Every member of the Legislature wants to help seniors stay in their own homes as long as possible, but the problem with this bill is that people who need the help the most don't have the money to qualify for this tax credit. Has the Liberal government become so out of touch with the reality faced by many seniors that they actually believe a senior making \$25,000 will spend 40% of their income on home renovations to get less than 1% of their total income back? The McGuinty Liberals are

dreaming in Technicolor if they think this latest scheme will eventually help those it claims to.

What's more alarming is that, one after another, members on the government side have stood up to defend the math on this bill and to defend the rationale behind spending maybe \$64 million or maybe more, because no one seems to know how much this program will actually cost.

Last week the Drummond commission made it painfully clear: Ontario is in the mess we're in today because this government has failed to keep spending in line with revenues. The McGuinty Liberals have been such a colossal failure that we're now on the road to a \$30-billion deficit and a total debt of well over \$400 billion. Thanks to the fiscal mismanagement of the McGuinty-Duncan duo, Ontario is on the road to becoming just like Greece. And while this government has continued spending more than \$2 billion since the last election on key priorities like un-building the power plant in Mississauga—we all told them not to build it in the first place, the hole our children—in this case, my newborn, Murphy Harris—

**Interjection:** Congratulations. Way to go.

**Interjection:** One week today.

**Mr. Michael Harris:**—who is a week old, watching at home on TV, is now strapped with a \$21,000 debt before he even took his own first breath, which is unfortunate. Our grandchildren and, yes, even our great-grandchildren, will inherit—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Michael Harris:** It just keeps getting better. Oh, he's finely tuned.

But with all the spin doctors the Liberals have hired lately, who I'm sure are now hard at work trying to save the Minister of Health from her scandal at Ornge, it's no wonder this government hasn't got a clue what average Ontarians face each and every day.

So the problem with this bill, as has been the case with so many other bills passed by the McGuinty government, is that it only benefits a very small percentage of Ontarians. What's even worse is that it ignores those who face a daily struggle to stay in their own homes as a result of this government's reckless spending and tax increases on life's necessities, seniors like Bill from Elmira, who I met during the election. Bill considers any type of home renovation to be an unaffordable luxury because he's having a hard time simply making ends meet.

But I think we're losing sight of the most important thing in this debate. In today's difficult economy, in a time when reckless spending by this government has left the cupboards bare, we should be asking ourselves what kind of government program will help the most people. If members on the other side of the House judged Bill 2 by this standard, they would have no choice but to agree with the majority in this place, members of the PC and NDP caucuses who know that if you want to help the most people, you do it by giving broad-based relief that not only a few people can afford to take advantage of.

You know, sometimes politics gets in the way of good decision-making. Liberal members on the government side often dismiss criticism of their record as just rhetoric. But even the Auditor General and now the Drummond commission have questioned the value for money spent on many Liberal spending programs just like this one.

1730

Unfortunately, as the *Globe and Mail*, *Toronto Sun*, *National Post* and our friends even at the *Toronto Star* have reported, this government has dug Ontario a hole so deep that it will take austerity measures that have not been seen before in Canada to get this province back on track. To kick-start a recovery and avert Ontario's bankruptcy, the McGuinty Liberal government must declare a quarantine zone around the public purse—no more new, uncosted, one-off spending incentives like this one. If Dalton McGuinty declines any of Mr. Drummond's recommendations, a new idea to save money must be put forward in its place, and the government needs to act on the ideas put forward by the Ontario PC caucus and our leader, Tim Hudak, including a public sector wage freeze, introducing competition in public services and implementing pro-growth policies such as apprenticeship reform.

In the weeks leading up to the release of the 2012-13 Ontario budget, the government should be focusing on these priorities, not looking for ways to spend more monies we don't have on new programs that offer questionable results.

Thanks to this government, Ontario is no longer the economic powerhouse it once was. Now we have yielded that title to Alberta, Saskatchewan, BC and even Newfoundland. If Ontario is ever to regain our economic strength, if Ontario is ever to again become the destination of choice for new immigrants, we need to get our fiscal house in order. This government must start spending taxpayers' money more carefully.

It's time the McGuinty Liberals stopped acting like they still have a majority. It's time for the Premier and all members of cabinet to listen to the new majority in this Legislature: those seated on this side of the House.

We all want to help seniors in our communities and across our province. In my view, voting against this bill is the best way to support every Ontario senior. It's the only way we can pressure this government to work with the opposition to provide real relief for seniors. For these reasons, I cannot—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. Comments and questions?

**Mr. Paul Miller:** I listened intently to the member from Kitchener-Conestoga. He made some good points.

I personally have a major problem with this \$10,000 rebate, if you want to call it that, on home renovations. Let's talk about the HST on it. That's \$1,300, and they're going to give you \$1,500 back, so you're \$200 ahead there. But then you had to borrow the \$10,000 from the bank, because you don't have \$10,000. So with the interest you paid on the \$10,000 from the bank, now

you're down \$200. When the government is trying to do things that are going to help people, you might want to start by taking the HST off.

They also forget that in different parts of the province, building and material costs differ up north for types of wood or different things that are required, or even in the south, depending on what you're doing to the house, whether it be brick work, a new roof, whatever you need. Costs change all over the province. Probably, the further you go north, the costs are going to be more, so you've lost there again. In fact, I think this \$10,000 credit is going to end up costing them about \$5,000. So I really don't think it's doing much.

Take the HST off it. Take the costs that they have to pay to the subcontractors to do the business—you forget about that: The contractor is going to charge you HST on his service, too. So you might want to take the HST off the contractors who are doing the work service, too. Then it might work.

I don't think, when this government does things, they take everything into consideration. I don't think this government takes a look at the big picture or even the details, obviously, because this is an absolute joke. It's not going to work, and it's going to cost them more than—and I don't even think some of the people can borrow the \$10,000. I don't think the banks will lend it to them. Good luck.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Mr. Mario Sergio:** I think we have to keep this particular piece of legislation in its proper perspective. It has nothing to do with the global economy, the federal economy or the economy of Ontario. It is strictly trying to help our most needy people, our seniors, that I believe everybody wants to support. The fact is, even the smallest assistance that we can provide our seniors would go a long way in keeping our seniors living comfortably in their homes. We are not talking \$10,000; we are saying tax rebates up to \$10,000 of expenses.

Madam Speaker, to a senior, even widening the opening to their bathroom would be a huge assistance and would bring some benefit to that senior, to continue to live in their own home instead of being forced to go into a nursing home, where it costs a lot more money. The intention is—and the heading of the bill is very clear—to provide some assistance and tax rebates to seniors who can afford it but need some assistance, some help, to continue to live in their own present residence. What a wonderful thing to do for seniors who want to stay in their community, in their home, with some minimum expenses. They don't have to go and borrow money, and if they do, they would have to go to a family member for assistance, but we are talking about maybe even lowering a drawer so that they can reach it from a particular wheelchair. So let's look at the bill for what it is, let's not read more than what it is, and I hope that at the end we can all support our seniors in our own individual ridings. I thank you, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Mr. Monte McNaughton:** Thank you, Speaker, and I just wanted to say congratulations to my good friend from Kitchener–Conestoga, the MPP, on the birth of his son Murphy. Congratulations to the member and to Sarah on the birth of their son. It must be an exciting time. On behalf of all the members, we wish you all the best.

The member from Kitchener–Conestoga and I go back a few years. We both ran in the 2007 campaign. We arrived here four years later, and now we're here to hold to account the most fiscally irresponsible government in Canadian history. I can tell you, Speaker, without a doubt—again, as I said earlier here today, the number \$411 billion is staring us in the face. In 2017, that's what the debt could rise to in the province, and we see the government on a reckless spending spree: again, \$2.5 billion in new spending outlined in the throne speech. We have Bill 2, which is going to cost millions of dollars. The government can't help themselves. I mean, they're just addicted to spending, and again, they're just extremely irresponsible. I know I'm hearing in my riding of Lambton–Kent–Middlesex that we need change, that we need a new course, a new direction. We encourage the government to listen to members on this side of the House, a fiscally responsible party, a party that's interested in future generations, the betterment of future generations. We want to get the fiscal house in order. We have courage, we have conviction, something that the Premier is lacking and his ministers are lacking.

So, again, Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity, and congratulations again to the member from Kitchener–Conestoga.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. Comments and questions?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** It's nice to be able to comment on the members from Kitchener–Conestoga, Hamilton East–Stoney Creek and Lambton–Kent–Middlesex, and with the two on this side I share something: I also ran in 2007. It took me two tries too. Something I remember from the 2007 campaign is that I ran against a cabinet minister from the other side, and in the debates he told me, told our people in the towns that were having a lot of trouble at that time, that resource extraction was a sunset industry, and we might as well get used to it because mining was over—four years ago, mining was over. Now in the throne speech and in the Drummond report, what is the shining light? The Ring of Fire.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. John Vanthof:** No, not thanks to Liberals—thanks to events beyond our control. But it just goes to show that there's not a whole lot of planning involved on behalf of the government, there really isn't. What we're supposed to be debating here, the wealthy home—no, not the wealthy home; it's the healthy homes renovation tax credit. Pardon me, Madam Speaker. I misspoke. I wasn't trying to make a pun here. For the people who can't afford to fix their home, who can't afford to pay—hydro rates are going to go up by, what, 40%? What are we going to do for those people? Are we going to say, a couple of years from now, "I guess seniors are just something we can't help"?

This is a huge issue we have to tackle. We have to tackle it in the north. We have to tackle it in the south. We have to tackle it all over with real legislation, not just fancy titles.

1740

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for Kitchener–Conestoga has two minutes to respond.

**Mr. Michael Harris:** I'd like to take the opportunity to thank my colleagues the members from Timiskaming–Cochrane, York West, Hamilton East–Stoney Creek and my good friend the member from Lambton–Kent–Middlesex, who, yes, said some nice words about our new family. Big brother Brayden, of course, will be watching on TV as well, but thank you for those. We did run in 2007 together. We're here to, again, hold this government to account.

I think one of the most troubling things we heard was how the Conference Board of Canada has recently reported on the fact that we're in a \$16-billion deficit, a \$252-billion debt. That's to grow, and even double, up to \$30 billion, a \$400-billion debt. In fact, as I was out in my community of Kitchener–Conestoga recently, I was telling people how, if debt was its own ministry, it would be the third-largest ministry, next to health and education. That's troubling; extremely troubling.

That's why I want to take the opportunity again to remind the government across the hall here how best to kick-start our economy and avert Ontario's bankruptcy that this government has got us in: with three measures. We're going to say, first: Declare a quarantine zone around the public purse—a big, big one. No more new, uncoded, one-off spending initiatives like this one; absolutely not.

**Interjection:** Focus like a laser beam.

**Mr. Michael Harris:** As Tim would say, focus like a laser beam. If Dalton McGuinty declines any of Mr. Drummond's recommendations, a new idea to save money must be put forward in its place. And the government needs to act on the ideas put forward by our PC caucus and our leader, Tim Hudak, including a public sector wage freeze, introducing competition in public services and implementing pro-growth policies such as apprenticeship reform.

Again, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to speak to this bill today, and again another reason why we can't support it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** I was wanting just to put a couple of things in second reading on the debate for this particular bill because I think that this is going to be in committee, and there are a couple of things I was hoping that we were going to deal with. Do I support generally what this bill is trying to do? Obviously. This is motherhood and apple pie. Who doesn't believe that we should be helping seniors to retrofit their homes for whatever, be it for energy efficiency, be it in order to live more independently at home? Absolutely. I don't think

anybody in this House will disagree with the basic concept of the bill. So I don't have a problem supporting this particular bill at second reading.

However, I think there are a couple of things that I would like to see once we get into committee. One thing—and I don't mean to be partisan on this one, but I will be—is that the government is really good at making these kinds of announcements but not very good at getting the money out the door sometimes. So maybe one of the things we've got to do in this bill is to try to figure out some way that the government actually does what it says it's going to do in the bill, because there have been too many examples where initiatives have been announced by the government, and they have a big press conference ahead of time, and they have a big press conference a little bit into it, and they talk about this wonderful thing that they've done, and then nothing comes of it. So I think we need to have some mechanism to ensure that, in fact, the seniors get the benefit that we're talking about when it comes to being able to help those particular seniors at home.

It also gives me an opportunity to talk a little bit about the difficulty we're having vis-à-vis—we're all in agreement in this House that the budget should be balanced by 2017-18. All of us had it in our platforms in the last election, and rightfully so.

One of the things we need to figure out is one of the ways that we can save money. This bill, in a funny kind of way, can help us do that if we were to think a little bit more boldly, and that is, how many seniors do we have in Ontario that, given the proper support at home—and sometimes it's as simple as doing a retrofit in the home: having a ramp so that the senior can get in and out of their home; being able to have handles in the shower, in the bathroom; being able to have whatever it might be so that the person is able to live within their home and not be in a position of having to, unfortunately before their time, end up inside a long-term-care institution.

One of the things that maybe we should be looking at as we bring this bill into committee—and it will go to committee; I don't think that our caucus is going to speak to this bill very much more than I am now—is to take a look at how we can truly help seniors live independently within their home.

I'll give you a very quick story. I would use the name of the constituent, but she hasn't given me permission, so I don't want to use her name. All of us understand this.

Each one of us has had this happen in our constituency office. A woman who lives in Timmins—she's in her late 70s—is able to live perfectly independently at home if she can deal with the washing and the drying of clothes. Her condition, as far as arthritis—she's managed to sort of lick the issue of how to prepare meals and how to do some of the basic chores she has got to do in the house, but she cannot deal with the washer and dryer because of the physical set-up.

This particular person has asked a community care access centre to provide her with somebody to go to her home to do her laundry once or twice a week so that she

can live independently and not have to worry about, "Who's going to do my laundry this week?" She can't get the services because she doesn't qualify, because she's not sick enough, if you follow what I'm getting at. In order to be able to qualify for the services at home from the community care access centre, you have to meet a certain threshold. Because her threshold is not as pronounced as it could be, or as it should be in order to get the services, she's not getting anybody coming to her home to assist her with doing her laundry.

Well, imagine if we can amend this bill so that this particular woman can say—okay, it's a question of doing something physically in the home so that she can get to her washer and dryer. Her washer and dryer are in the basement. She's got arthritis in her knees; she's got arthritis in her hands. She can't get down the stairs. She fears, going down the stairs, that she will fall and hurt herself, and in fact, that's what could happen. Imagine if she does fall. The catastrophic cost to her, as an individual and a human being, is awful, but for a medical system, it's even more expensive, because then you'll have to take care of somebody in a much more pronounced state of a health crisis. Who knows? Maybe that person's going to end up in a long-term-care institution because the injuries might be such that she can't return home and live independently.

So imagine if we can use this money, use this tax credit, in some way that allows her to retrofit her home in some way so that the washer and dryer can be on the main floor, where she can get at them and not have to worry about falling down the stairs when she goes down into the basement to do her washing and drying.

These, I think, are some of sort of the practical things that we need to look at, not just in this bill but as we look at our health care system, about how can we support people at home so that they don't need to have the services of a hospital or a long-term-care facility to be able to survive.

There is a really interesting report that I read—I don't remember what Scandinavian country it is, but I remember it was one of the Scandinavian countries. They actually passed legislation that prevents them from building long-term-care beds, something we would never do in Ontario, because Ontario's not at that point in the development of community care. Their point is that if you build a long-term-care bed, then you've got to put somebody in it. They're saying, "No, let's put all of our emphasis on making sure that we can have people live at home and live at home independently." Rather than putting money into the long-term-care bed, they're putting money into the community so that there's a nurse who can go over and care for the person when it comes to their medical needs and so that if you need Meals on Wheels or whatever it might be, in fact those types of services happen.

If we are able to look at that, and we're able to make that sort of shift—we've already started. To be fair, Ontario, under all three governments—NDP, Conservatives and Liberals—has been moving in this direction

over the last 20 years, but we haven't taken it home yet in the sense of we've not gone probably as far as we should have.

I just want to give one other example, a phone call that I got from my sister today, and I can use her name because she's my sister, and she's given me permission, I'm sure. My sister suffers from schizophrenia. She lives at home independently and does quite, quite well. She is coping amazingly. She takes her medication; that's two thirds of the battle with these types of diseases.

But she's got some physical restrictions. She's starting to have some problems as she gets a little bit older. She's starting to have some problems trying to survive at home. One of the things that we went through at Christmastime and now is that she, for some reason, has something going on with her leg that they haven't quite figured out, but she's not able to stand.

The amount of work that she had to through in order to get something like Meals on Wheels brought into her apartment so she can stay at home independently was quite complex.

1750

Here's a fairly functional person. My sister is quite functional. She has a brother who understands the system because I advocate on behalf of people all the time. So I could tell her where to call and what she had to do. But, imagine you're the person who doesn't have those skills and doesn't have somebody who understands the system. That person would still be eating basically takeout food and eating foods that are probably no good for you because you wouldn't have the ability to even know how to draw down the services from the CCAC. That's the other part of the problem.

In the case of my sister, lucky for her, Louise is very functional. We're able to advise her. My daughter is a nurse practitioner, one daughter works in the community, in social services, and I do what I do. We were able to advise her so that she does what she does, but I would bet that about nine out of 10 families probably don't have that type of support system, and so people go without services that they're entitled to because they don't even know where to pick up the phone and call.

I look forward to this bill going into committee. I know that our caucus will be interested in making some amendments to this bill that we hope the government will support because we think there's a way of taking this bill to the next step so that we can actually do some of the things that are intended in this particular bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Comments and questions?

**Ms. Dipika Damerla:** I'd like to thank the members from Timmins-James Bay, Timiskaming-Cochrane and Kitchener-Conestoga for their comments.

I'm going to begin by framing this whole debate by the fact, as the member from Scarborough-Agincourt earlier mentioned, that by 2017 there will be more people over the age of 65 than children under the age of 14. That's a historic shift in our demographics, and we have to think of a new way of how we're going to take care of

an aging society. And certainly, building long-term care endlessly is not part of the solution. What our research shows is that today's seniors are living longer and healthier than ever before, and they want to live as long as they can in their own homes. That is what this bill is all about.

What I've heard in the debate today is that the NDP is saying that this bill doesn't go far enough, and what I'm hearing from the Conservatives or the PC Party is that this is a waste of money. The reality is somewhere in the middle, which is usually the Liberal ground, and I'm really proud of the fact that we're going to come up the middle with a solution that I hope will work for everybody.

In particular, I really appreciate the constructive comments that I got from the member from Timmins-James Bay because instead of just criticizing, he actually told us where he thinks we can make improvements. That's the way the dialogue starts, and I really appreciate that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Questions and comments?

**Ms. Laurie Scott:** I'm pleased today to rise to give comment on Bill 2, the healthy homes renovation tax credit brought in by the Liberals. We've heard lots of those nice words, "You should all be in favour," whatever. I've also listened to the debate and read the bill. What do seniors really need? How many people are you really helping over there? We've all heard from our constituents, like the member from Timmins-James Bay has said, about problems in the riding and helping seniors. There's only a small group of seniors that is actually going to be able to make those renovations. The tax credit, up to \$10,000—I don't have a lot of seniors in my riding who can put out that kind of money to do renovations and be able to stay in their homes. What we've heard from seniors is they actually need real care in their homes, care to stay in their homes, helping them with meals, shovelling off their sidewalks.

The government is very good at spin over there and says, "We're doing everything we can in our power to keep our seniors more at home." Well, we all want that, but we've seen from the last eight years that that really hasn't helped. They actually haven't done it. They've brought in some programs with some short-term successes. I will give a couple of successes that they've had, but in the long term that has not really helped seniors stay in their home.

Today, we're debating Bill 2, another bill nicely titled, this is all good, seniors happy—again, it might help a very, very small group of seniors. We have a lot of seniors, especially in my riding of Haliburton-Kawartha Lakes-Brock, one of the highest percentages in the province. They need real help. They didn't need the HST on their hydro bills and on their home heating bills taking money out of their pockets, forcing some of them out of their homes. What are we going to be doing with the seniors that we're forcing out of their homes? Where are they going to live?

There's a bigger policy picture that the Liberals are not addressing. Just these fluff bills like Bill 2 are not going to do it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Miss Monique Taylor:** Again, it's my privilege to be able to speak to this matter. There have been several great comments made today on this bill. I'm looking at this and, again, it's \$130 million of taxpayers' money that's being budgeted towards this. Who's going to be benefiting from this? A very small margin of seniors are going to be able to benefit from this.

Not many seniors in my riding are telling me that they have this disposable income. I'm not saying that this isn't an initiative that should be going forward because, yes, it is going to benefit many families, but what are we going to do about the families that can't afford it? The families that are once again falling through the cracks? Seniors have paid into these taxes all of their lives, and to be able to get a little bit back at the end of the day, they're not asking for much.

How many of them do we have eating out of food banks? They can't afford to pay their hydro bills. These are the kinds of initiatives that our seniors, that my seniors are talking to me at home about. Once again, they're worried about their prescription costs. They're worried about their pensions. Are their pensions even secure?

There's a lot going on out there in Ontario, and I don't think that a tax incentive such as this is enough for the everyday Ontarian. I think that we need to just make sure that when we are in committee that we are tweaking it to make it just a little bit better, that we're going to be able to include all seniors in Ontario in this bill and that we can make it better for everybody.

So again, thank you for allowing me to add my voice to this matter.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Yes, the member for Ottawa Centre.

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to speak on this very important bill, the healthy homes renovation tax credit. I want to commend the member for Timmins-James Bay for his comments and open mind towards this bill on how, in his view, it could be improved. I think that's a very good sign, especially in this minority government. That's the kind of conversation we need to have so that we can improve initiatives and work together to help Ontarians.

I think there is a bigger picture element in this bill. Most of the comments that are being made are very limited to what this bill is trying to accomplish. But the bigger picture is what the bill is trying to do is keep seniors away from our hospitals and long-term-care facilities, and that's where the real cost is. The cost is not this bill. This is actually the very small measure to keep, even though a narrow number of seniors, as has been mentioned by the opposition—but all those seniors do end up then going to hospitals and taking up acute care

beds, which are very expensive, or they would need care in a long-term-care facility, which is even more expensive. We need to make sure that we do everything possible to keep them home because the cost is far more limited than it is in a long-term-care facility or in a hospital setting.

I think in this day and age with this kind of fiscal environment we need to ensure that we bring this kind of transformation so we can reduce the cost of our health care system as we work together to eliminate the deficit. This is what this bill is trying to do. I think we should stay focused on that aspect of it because this is going to be big.

I think my friend from Mississauga East-Cooksville aptly mentioned—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. The member for Timmins-James Bay has two minutes to respond.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I apologize: I was all choked up, and I'm still choked up. I've got a little bit of a cold here.

I just want to thank the members for responding to what my few comments were on this bill. As I said, is this a bill that we can support? Obviously, you know, if we're able to do something to assist seniors, that's a good thing.

However, I just want to say again, the real difficulty is making sure the government actually does what it says in this bill. I think we need to have something in the end that ensures that the money that's announced does flow in some way so that, in fact, there's some mechanism to make sure that these tax credits are taken up in some way. I'm not sure how you do that, but that's something we have to look at in committee.

I just want to end, again, on the point that I think nobody in this House, from any side of the House, disagrees with the idea of how we're able to allow mechanisms to let people live in their homes independently, because clearly it's a heck of a lot more expensive to put people in long-term-care institutions or hospitals. If we can figure out ways to provide support so that people can live at home, I think that's a good thing.

Part of that support, obviously, is the services of the CCACs. Community care access centres are the ones that send the nurse, that send the homemakers, that send Meals on Wheels. Those services are often hard to get in our communities. Often people are having to make decisions of being institutionalized far sooner than they should because they can't get the services that they need to live at home.

In some cases, it's a question of making sure that we're able to renovate the home in some way—not renovate, but retrofit the home, that we can change the house in some way so that the person is able to live there and not have a lot of difficulty. I pointed out the one experience that I just saw recently where a woman is having to think about moving out of her home because the washer and dryer are downstairs, and she can't get down there with her arthritis and worries she's going to

fall and hurt herself or possibly severely injure herself. If we were able to use this so that she can have her washer and dryer on the main floor, that could be a good thing.

*Second reading debate deemed adjourned.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** It being 6 of the clock, this House stands adjourned until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

*The House adjourned at 1801.*

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO**  
**ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: Hon. / L'hon. David C. Onley, O.Ont.

Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Dave Levac

Clerk / Greffière: Deborah Deller

Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman, Tonia Grannum

Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Albanese, Laura (LIB)	York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston	
Armstrong, Teresa J. (NDP)	London–Fanshawe	
Arnott, Ted (PC)	Wellington–Haltoun Hills	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée
Bailey, Robert (PC)	Sarnia–Lambton	
Balkissoon, Bas (LIB)	Scarborough–Rouge River	Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée Deputy Speaker / Vice-président
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand–Norfolk	
Bartolucci, Hon. / L'hon. Rick (LIB)	Sudbury	Chair of Cabinet / Président du Conseil des ministres Minister of Northern Development and Mines / Ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Bentley, Hon. / L'hon. Christopher (LIB)	London West / London-Ouest	Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie
Berardinetti, Lorenzo (LIB)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	
Best, Hon. / L'hon. Margaret R. (LIB)	Scarborough–Guildwood	Minister of Consumer Services / Ministre des Services aux consommateurs
Bisson, Gilles (NDP)	Timmins–James Bay / Timmins–Baie James	House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire de parti reconnu
Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (LIB)	St. Catharines	Minister of the Environment / Ministre de l'Environnement Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
Broten, Hon. / L'hon. Laurel C. (LIB)	Etobicoke–Lakeshore	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation Minister Responsible for Women's Issues / Ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Campbell, Sarah (NDP)	Kenora–Rainy River	
Cansfield, Donna H. (LIB)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	
Chan, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)	Markham–Unionville	Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport / Ministre de Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport
Chiarelli, Hon. / L'hon. Bob (LIB)	Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Minister of Infrastructure / Ministre de l'Infrastructure Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Halton	
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds–Grenville	
Colle, Mike (LIB)	Eglinton–Lawrence	
Coteau, Michael (LIB)	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	
Crack, Grant (LIB)	Glengarry–Prescott–Russell	
Craitor, Kim (LIB)	Niagara Falls	
Damerla, Dipika (LIB)	Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville	
Delaney, Bob (LIB)	Mississauga–Streetsville	
Dhillon, Vic (LIB)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Dickson, Joe (LIB)	Ajax–Pickering	
DiNovo, Cheri (NDP)	Parkdale–High Park	
Duguid, Hon. / L'hon. Brad (LIB)	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Minister of Economic Development and Innovation / Ministre du Développement économique et de l'Innovation
Duncan, Hon. / L'hon. Dwight (LIB)	Windsor–Tecumseh	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / Président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement Deputy Premier / Vice-premier ministre Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances
Dunlop, Garfield (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	
Elliott, Christine (PC)	Whitby–Oshawa	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Fedeli, Victor (PC)	Nipissing	
Flynn, Kevin Daniel (LIB)	Oakville	
Forster, Cindy (NDP)	Welland	Deputy House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire adjointe de parti reconnu
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	
<b>Gerretsen, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles	Attorney General / Procureur général
<b>Gravelle, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Thunder Bay–Superior North / Thunder Bay–Superior-Nord	Minister of Natural Resources / Ministre des Richesses naturelles
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	
Harris, Michael (PC)	Kitchener–Conestoga	
Hillier, Randy (PC)	Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington	
Horwath, Andrea (NDP)	Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre	Leader, Recognized Party / Chef de parti reconnu Leader, New Democratic Party of Ontario / Chef du Nouveau parti démocratique de l'Ontario
<b>Hoskins, Hon. / L'hon. Eric (LIB)</b>	St. Paul's	Minister of Children and Youth Services / Ministre des Services à l'enfance et à la jeunesse
Hudak, Tim (PC)	Niagara West–Glanbrook / Niagara-Ouest–Glanbrook	Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle Leader, Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur de l'Ontario
Jackson, Rod (PC)	Barrie	
Jaczek, Helena (LIB)	Oak Ridges–Markham	
<b>Jeffrey, Hon. / L'hon. Linda (LIB)</b>	Brampton–Springdale	Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail Minister Responsible for Seniors / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires des personnes âgées
Jones, Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin–Caledon	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Klees, Frank (PC)	Newmarket–Aurora	
Kwinter, Monte (LIB)	York Centre / York-Centre	
Leal, Jeff (LIB)	Peterborough	
Leone, Rob (PC)	Cambridge	
<b>Levac, Hon. / L'hon. Dave (LIB)</b>	Brant	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
MacCharles, Tracy (LIB)	Pickering–Scarborough East / Pickering–Scarborough-Est	
MacLaren, Jack (PC)	Carleton–Mississippi Mills	
MacLeod, Lisa (PC)	Nepean–Carleton	
Mangat, Amrit (LIB)	Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud	
Mantha, Michael (NDP)	Algoma–Manitoulin	
Marchese, Rosario (NDP)	Trinity–Spadina	
<b>Matthews, Hon. / L'hon. Deborah (LIB)</b>	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / Ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Mauro, Bill (LIB)	Thunder Bay–Atikokan	
McDonell, Jim (PC)	Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry	
<b>McGuinty, Hon. / L'hon. Dalton (LIB)</b>	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales Premier / Premier ministre Leader, Government / Chef du gouvernement Leader, Liberal Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti libéral de l'Ontario
McKenna, Jane (PC)	Burlington	
<b>McMeekin, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (LIB)</b>	Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough–Westdale	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
McNaughton, Monte (PC)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	
McNeely, Phil (LIB)	Ottawa–Orléans	
<b>Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (LIB)</b>	Ottawa–Vanier	Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / Ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones
Miller, Norm (PC)	Parry Sound–Muskoka	
<b>Miller, Paul (NDP)</b>	Hamilton East–Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est–Stoney Creek	Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Milligan, Rob E. (PC)	Northumberland—Quinte West	
<b>Milloy, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	Minister of Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Moridi, Reza (LIB)	Richmond Hill	
<b>Munro, Julia (PC)</b>	York—Simcoe	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Murray, Hon. / L'hon. Glen R. (LIB)</b>	Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Naqvi, Yasir (LIB)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	
Natyshak, Taras (NDP)	Essex	
Nicholls, Rick (PC)	Chatham—Kent—Essex	
O'Toole, John (PC)	Durham	
Oraziatti, David (LIB)	Sault Ste. Marie	
Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Oshawa	
Pettapiece, Randy (PC)	Perth—Wellington	
Piruzza, Teresa (LIB)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	
Prue, Michael (NDP)	Beaches—East York	
Qaadri, Shafiq (LIB)	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	
Sandals, Liz (LIB)	Guelph	
Schein, Jonah (NDP)	Davenport	
Scott, Laurie (PC)	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	
Sergio, Mario (LIB)	York West / York-Ouest	
Shurman, Peter (PC)	Thornhill	
Singh, Jagmeet (NDP)	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	
Smith, Todd (PC)	Prince Edward—Hastings	
Sorbara, Greg (LIB)	Vaughan	
<b>Sousa, Hon. / L'hon. Charles (LIB)</b>	Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration / Ministre des Affaires civiques et de l'Immigration
Tabuns, Peter (NDP)	Toronto—Danforth	
<b>Takhar, Hon. / L'hon. Harinder S. (LIB)</b>	Mississauga—Erindale	Minister of Government Services / Ministre des Services gouvernementaux
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain	
Thompson, Lisa M. (PC)	Huron—Bruce	
Vanthof, John (NDP)	Timiskaming—Cochrane	
Walker, Bill (PC)	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	
Wilson, Jim (PC)	Simcoe—Grey	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle
Witmer, Elizabeth (PC)	Kitchener—Waterloo	
Wong, Soo (LIB)	Scarborough—Agincourt	
<b>Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (LIB)</b>	Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Yakabuski, John (PC)	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	
Yurek, Jeff (PC)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	
Zimmer, David (LIB)	Willowdale	







*Continued from back cover*

<b>Dimitra Daskalos</b>	
Mr. Peter Tabuns.....	532
<b>Kindness Week</b>	
Mr. Yasir Naqvi .....	532
<b>Rob Shouldice</b>	
Mr. Bill Walker.....	532
<b>Long-term care</b>	
Mme France Gélinas .....	533
<b>Lent</b>	
Mr. Joe Dickson .....	533
<b>Jean Pigott</b>	
Ms. Lisa MacLeod .....	533
<b>Eleanor Miller</b>	
Mr. Bill Mauro .....	534
<b>Government's record</b>	
Mr. John O'Toole.....	534
<b>Tabling of sessional papers</b>	
The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro) .....	535

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS / DÉPÔT DES PROJETS DE LOI

<b>Major-General Sir Isaac Brock Day Act, 2012, Bill 32, Mr. Clark / Loi de 2012 sur le Jour du major-général Sir Isaac Brock, projet de loi 32, M. Clark</b>	
First reading agreed to.....	535
Mr. Steve Clark.....	535
<b>Toby's Act (Right to be Free from Discrimination and Harassment Because of Gender Identity or Gender Expression), 2012, Bill 33, Ms. DiNovo, Mrs. Elliott, Mr. Naqvi / Loi Toby de 2012 sur le droit à l'absence de discrimination et de harcèlement fondés sur l'identité ou l'expression sexuelles, projet de loi 33, Mme DiNovo, Mme Elliott, M. Naqvi</b>	
First reading agreed to.....	535
Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....	535

## MOTIONS

<b>Private members' public business</b>	
Hon. John Milloy .....	535
Motion agreed to .....	536

## PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS

<b>Long-term care</b>	
Mr. Ernie Hardeman.....	536

<b>Long-term care</b>	
Mr. Peter Tabuns.....	536
<b>Kidney disease</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal.....	536
<b>School accommodation</b>	
Ms. Lisa MacLeod .....	536
<b>Diagnostic services</b>	
Mme France Gélinas .....	537
<b>Kidney disease</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal.....	537
<b>Curriculum</b>	
Mr. Steve Clark .....	537
<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. Todd Smith.....	537
<b>Climate change</b>	
Mr. Phil McNeely.....	538
<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. Jim Wilson.....	538
<b>Kidney disease</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal.....	538
<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. John O'Toole.....	538

## ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

<b>Healthy Homes Renovation Tax Credit Act, 2012, Bill 2, Mr. Duncan / Loi de 2012 sur le crédit d'impôt pour l'aménagement du logement axé sur le bien-être, projet de loi 2, M. Duncan</b>	
Mr. Peter Tabuns.....	539
Mr. Joe Dickson .....	540
Mr. John O'Toole .....	540
Mr. John Vanthof .....	540
Mr. Bill Mauro .....	541
Mr. Peter Tabuns.....	541
Ms. Helena Jaczek.....	542
Mr. Rick Nicholls.....	543
Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti.....	543
Mr. Steve Clark .....	543
Mr. Taras Natyshak.....	544
Ms. Helena Jaczek.....	544
Mr. Ted Chudleigh.....	544
Miss Monique Taylor .....	546
Mr. Phil McNeely.....	546
Mr. Bill Walker .....	546
Mr. Ted Chudleigh.....	547
Mr. Taras Natyshak .....	547
Mr. Joe Dickson .....	548
Mr. Victor Fedeli.....	548

Mr. Peter Tabuns .....	549
Mrs. Laura Albanese.....	549
Mr. Taras Natyshak .....	549
Ms. Soo Wong .....	550
Mr. Rob Leone.....	551
Mr. John Vanthof.....	551
Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn.....	551
Mr. John Yakabuski.....	552
Ms. Soo Wong .....	552
Mr. Michael Harris .....	552
Mr. Paul Miller .....	554
Mr. Mario Sergio .....	554
Mr. Monte McNaughton.....	555
Mr. John Vanthof.....	555
Mr. Michael Harris .....	555
Mr. Gilles Bisson.....	555
Ms. Dipika Damerla .....	557
Ms. Laurie Scott .....	557
Miss Monique Taylor .....	558
Mr. Yasir Naqvi.....	558
Mr. Gilles Bisson.....	558
Second reading debate deemed adjourned.....	559

## CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Tuesday 21 February 2012 / Mardi 21 février 2012

### ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

<b>Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act, 2012, Bill 11, Mr. Duguid / Loi de 2012 visant à attirer les investissements et à créer des emplois, projet de loi 11, M. Duguid</b>	
Mr. Monte McNaughton .....	511
Mr. Gilles Bisson .....	519
Mrs. Liz Sandals .....	519
Mr. Steve Clark .....	520
Mr. Jagmeet Singh .....	520
Mr. Monte McNaughton .....	520
Second reading debate deemed adjourned .....	521

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac) .....	521
Ms. Sylvia Jones .....	521
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne .....	521
Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn .....	521
Hon. Margaret R. Best .....	521
Mr. Gilles Bisson .....	521
Mr. Jack MacLaren .....	521

### ORAL QUESTIONS / QUESTIONS ORALES

#### Public services

Mr. Tim Hudak .....	521
Hon. Dalton McGuinty .....	521

#### Public services

Mr. Tim Hudak .....	522
Hon. Dalton McGuinty .....	522

#### Ontario economy

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	523
Hon. Dalton McGuinty .....	523

#### Air ambulance service

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	524
Hon. Dalton McGuinty .....	524

#### Air ambulance service

Mr. Frank Klees .....	525
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	525

#### Air ambulance service

Mme France Gélinas .....	525
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	525

#### Economic development

Ms. Tracy MacCharles .....	526
Hon. Brad Duguid .....	526

#### Air ambulance service

Mr. Frank Klees .....	526
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	527

#### Job creation

Mr. Rosario Marchese .....	527
Hon. Brad Duguid .....	527

#### Energy policies

Mrs. Liz Sandals .....	528
Hon. Christopher Bentley .....	528

#### School transportation

Ms. Lisa MacLeod .....	528
Hon. Laurel C. Broten .....	528

#### Labour relations

Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong .....	529
Hon. Brad Duguid .....	529

#### Road safety

Mrs. Teresa Piruzza .....	529
Hon. Bob Chiarelli .....	529

#### Pan Am Games

Mr. Rod Jackson .....	530
Hon. Charles Sousa .....	530

#### Addiction services

Ms. Sarah Campbell .....	530
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	531

#### Forest industry

Mr. Grant Crack .....	531
Hon. Michael Gravelle .....	531

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Ms. Cheri DiNovo .....	531
Mr. Peter Tabuns .....	531
Mr. Yasir Naqvi .....	531

### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS / DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

#### Student demonstration

Mr. Peter Shurman .....	532
-------------------------	-----

*Continued on inside back cover*



No. 14

N° 14

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

First Session, 40<sup>th</sup> Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 40<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Wednesday 22 February 2012**

**Mercredi 22 février 2012**



Speaker  
Honourable Dave Levac

Président  
L'honorable Dave Levac

Clerk  
Deborah Deller

Greffière  
Deborah Deller

### **Hansard on the Internet**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

### **Le Journal des débats sur Internet**

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

### **Renseignements sur l'index**

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.

---

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services  
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building  
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park  
Toronto ON M7A 1A2  
Telephone 416-325-7400; fax 416-325-7430  
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service du Journal des débats et d'interprétation  
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement  
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park  
Toronto ON M7A 1A2  
Téléphone, 416-325-7400; télécopieur, 416-325-7430  
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 22 February 2012

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 22 février 2012

*The House met at 0900.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Please join me in prayer.

*Prayers.*

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### ATTRACTING INVESTMENT AND CREATING JOBS ACT, 2012

### LOI DE 2012 VISANT À ATTIRER LES INVESTISSEMENTS ET À CRÉER DES EMPLOIS

Resuming the debate adjourned on February 21, 2012, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 11, An Act respecting the continuation and establishment of development funds in order to promote regional economic development in eastern and southwestern Ontario / Projet de loi 11, Loi concernant la prorogation et la création de fonds de développement pour promouvoir le développement économique régional dans l'Est et le Sud-Ouest de l'Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Trinity-Spadina.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** I'm very happy to make a contribution to this debate on Bill 11. And there's so much to say, it's hard to know where to begin.

Just to explain briefly what the bill does, the bill provides the government with the legal framework to continue the eastern Ontario development fund and create a new southwestern Ontario development fund to promote economic development in southwestern Ontario.

I want to say from the outset that we will be supporting the bill, obviously, but we have a series of criticisms that we think the Liberals need to look at and/or correct, and I will speak to those four points in a little while. But I want to say, overall, that I have some concerns about where the government is going, where it went for a long time along with my Conservative brothers, who are committed to market fundamentalisms, and indicate some of the problems connected to that.

**Mr. John O'Toole:** Fundamentalisms?

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** I was friendly, I think. I think some of you guys agree with that. If you disagree, please let me know.

I want to indicate that both Conservatives and Liberals have made gross errors when it comes to giving away billions and billions of dollars to corporations without

any obligations on those corporations. I consider that to be an egregious mistake.

Toby Sanger, an economist, said that we have given away—not we; you Tories and you Liberals—\$20 billion in corporate giveaways from 1999 to the present. That's a whole lot of money. I can't even count those zeros, but the fundamentalists can count those zeros. Twenty billion dollars just given away. And the idea of giving away taxpayers' money, citizens' money, is that those dollars would create jobs. Why else would Tories and Liberals give our money away? And the evidence is not there to show that jobs have been created. Now, if you listen to Tories, they'll keep saying, "We need to cut further." God bless them. And Liberals, unfortunately, have been following the same footprints.

There was a time when I had a friend in this Legislature, who was a Liberal, who used to agree with me. If I may speak or quote from my former friend:

"What the Conservatives are asking us to do is to cut corporate income taxes—those are taxes on profitable corporations—by \$2.3 billion.... That definitely means"—and he's very affirmative; he says, "That definitely means closing hospitals, firing nurses, cutting education."

**Mr. John O'Toole:** That's Bob Rae you're talking about.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** It could have been.

"It means driving up tuition fees. It means cutting the Ministry of the Environment and the like"—meaning there is more—"and it means running a deficit."

Can anybody figure that name out? Can any Liberal indicate who that might have been?

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** Bob Rae.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Bob Rae—it's another past.

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** D.M. are the initials?

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Sorry?

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** D.M. are the initials?

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** It was the Premier.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I'm just going through your list of former friends. I haven't got there yet.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** I have so many former friends.

That was Dalton McGuinty, and it wasn't long ago. How quickly can a Premier change his mind on something where he was very definitive, where he said, "That definitely means closing hospitals, firing nurses, cutting education. It means driving up tuition fees. It means cutting the Ministry of the Environment" and so on? How could the Premier have changed his mind so radically, so revolutionary—not even evolutionary, but so revolutionary—in a short period of time? Who changed his mind?

Who did he speak to that he could have been so definite about what he said and that within a space of a couple of years, lo and behold, he was cutting corporate taxes?

I don't get it. I don't understand those things, because it seemed to me that he was lucid at the time, that he had the capacity to understand, and that the little grey cells at the time were working. Within a couple of years, the grey cells simply disappear. I don't get that, and I'm worried about him, you see? I worry about him.

But I worry more about the little guys out there who are affected by his policies. It's the little guys I'm worried about, those who earn \$20,000, \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000, \$60,000. Those are the people I worry about, because as we enrich the very wealthy, we, by the very connection, make a whole lot of people poor outside in society.

Just to tell you, in the last couple of years, the Ontario government says that corporate income taxes will hand \$535 million to banks and \$135 million to insurance companies, because they need our money. You understand banks are in trouble, still. Even though we've been through this recession, the banks quite proudly say, "We've been spared because of our management practices, unlike America, Europe and so many other countries." Our Canadian banks still need a break because they're doing badly. God bless. I'd like to be a bank and make a couple of bucks the way they are.

0910

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Bank of Rosie.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Rosie bank. That's on top of the \$520 million provided to banks through the elimination of the capital tax—God bless—another gift. We just give it away to those who have, because the capital tax—those poor people who own so much capital, so much money; we need to cut the capital tax because they deserve it, they work so hard. We don't work hard. Regular folks don't work hard. Bankers, they work hard. Yes, sirree, and we've got to cut their capital tax and we've got to cut their corporate taxes because they work hard. Even though they manage the economy well, we've got to give them some more so they can pay their workers so little.

When my daughter started working at a bank when she was 26 or 27 and she was making—I think she started out at 26,000 bucks as a bank teller. I said, "Steph, what are you doing working in a bank? Why would you, with a four-year degree, work in a bank making 26,000 bucks?" These are the wealthiest—

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** They're still paying 12 bucks an hour.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** And they still pay—

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** Twelve bucks, tellers, it starts at the bank.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Twelve bucks?

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** Twelve bucks.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** When you add it up—

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** How is she doing now?

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** She's doing much better. She left the bank.

But these are rich, rich corporations, rich financial institutions that have a whole lot of money that they take from us. They pay their workers so badly and then we give them a tax cut and the Tories and Liberals say, "Oh, that creates jobs." Oh yeah? How many more jobs have we seen? And, by the way, have the salaries of the workers gone up? I don't think so.

Just to cite some statistics about who is doing well and who isn't: If the money did not go to create jobs, where did it go?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Excuse me. Could I remind the members when they enter the chamber that they should acknowledge the Chair? Thank you.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Where did the money go?

There you go, Minister; you just have to acknowledge the Chair.

Where did the money go if it didn't create more jobs, if salary increases didn't happen? There's an attachment here that I want to refer the members to, Mr. Chair—Mr. President.

Profits have increased significantly. CEOs have been awarded significant compensation increases. Dividends for shareholders have been boosted. But the hiring spree that Tories—God bless you—and Liberals—God bless you too—have been promising has not been coming. But, lo and behold, look at the enriched.

Scotia Bank: quarterly profit of \$1.2 billion. There was an increase of 19%; CEO pay, \$10.6 million. That was an increase of 10%.

Royal Bank: \$1.8 billion in profit, an increase of 23%; CEO pay, \$11 million. God bless; I'd like to have those—\$11 million, think about that.

We are in a good dollar, I have to admit, but not a lot on the menu.

TD Bank: quarterly profit of \$1.5 billion, up 19%; CEO pay—John, member from Durham—\$11.3 million, up 8%.

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** What bank was paying \$11 million?

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** TD Bank.

Bank of Montreal: \$776 million, up 18%; CEO pay, \$9.5 million, up 28%.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Hey, Rosie, they're hiring at the bank. You should put your name in.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Yeah. They tend to like Tories better, it seems, and a lot of the good Liberals.

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** But we want to do public sector wages.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Yeah, we'll get to that part perhaps.

Sun Life Financial: \$508-million profit, up 72%. These are the people who are doing badly these days. They need to jack up the rates because they're doing so badly. Profits are up \$508 million; profits, 72% up. The CEO pay is not available, meaning it's probably really high. We just haven't been able to get access to it; God bless. Manulife, same thing; Great West Life, same

idea—\$580 million, up 20%; the CEO pay is not available.

As you can see, they have done well. The old Premier Dalton McGuinty that I remember understood that giving away billions of dollars to corporations, to financial institutions, was just not going to work. That was the old Premier I used to like; the new one, I don't know. My impression is that from time to time a whole lot of Liberals think the same way, but you just have to zip it up, because otherwise you would be criticized tremendously—not by the Premier, but by the chief of staff, who wields so much power; and criticized by the banks, of course, the new friends of Dalton McGuinty, the Premier.

So the money doesn't go in creating jobs; the money does not go in increasing salaries; the money goes to increase the profits of the corporation, and it goes to increase the dividends to those who have money in the institution. But it doesn't go where it should, including productivity.

One of the arguments the fundamentalists make, along with the Liberals, is that if you invest in the corporations by reducing their corporate tax rates, they will invest in productivity. The evidence from Toby Sanger and so many other economists is that that has not happened. It hasn't happened. Much of their money is on hold. We are talking, by the statistics provided by Stats Canada—if I can just get a hold of them. Stats Canada says they have half a trillion dollars in savings because of a variety of issues: profits mostly, but also the \$20 billion that we have contributed provincially, by these two governments. So half a trillion, and in the last couple of years another \$86 billion has been added to those savings.

We are awash with money. Corporations and financial institutions have billions of dollars stashed away, saved, in cash holdings that could be invested in productivity, and they are not doing it. They're not creating the jobs. Yet the strategy of the federal Tories and the provincial governments, Tories and Liberals, is to give more of our money away. It's fundamentally idiotic, and they still are doing it.

To cite another study, by Bill Currie and Elliot Morris—Bill Currie is vice-chairman of Deloitte Canada and Deloitte's American managing director; Elliot Morris is a senior consultant at Deloitte. They say, "Surprisingly," we are not investing in productivity. "In the survey, Canadian executives indicated that they are not planning to invest in the types of activities required to improve productivity. When we look at the actual decisions Canadian business leaders make about activities that bolster productivity, such as investing in R&D"—research and development—"and commercializing innovation, Americans are 13% more tolerant of risk than Canadians, according to the Deloitte executive risk behaviour index.

"Canadian business leaders' aversion to risk is especially important because it underlies other critical contributors to our growing productivity gap, including a lack of risk capital for start-ups, chronic underinvestment in machinery and equipment, insufficient levels of pri-

vate sector R&D, and an unwillingness to engage international markets," they say.

#### 0920

"We need business leaders to be more willing to undertake intelligent risk by making investments in R&D, launching innovative products, developing improved production techniques, implementing international best practices, integrating state-of-the-art machinery, and expanding into new markets. Combined, these activities would contribute significantly to Canada's productivity and international competitiveness."

Now, Mr. Drummond understands this. He argues we should not invest, as a government, in job creation. He has given up on manufacturing, unlike Germans, who have an incredible commitment to manufacturing because it creates jobs—and good-paying jobs. He's saying we should give up on trying to shore up our manufacturing base, give up on job creation, and help corporations to increase their productivity.

Good Lord, we've been doing that for 15 to 20 years. Both Liberals, from Chrétien to Mr. Harper to former provincial Conservatives—God bless you again—to the current Liberals: All we've been doing—all you have been doing—is giving taxpayers' money away for the last 15 years, and still the result is the same. They take taxpayers' money and store it away for a rainy day, for a good day, when they can use those profits to buy up corporations that are crumbling, that are in debt, use our money to buy up whatever is available after the European crisis is over, or while it is still in a crisis, or while the Americans are still with their \$2-trillion or \$3-trillion deficit. That's what they use our money for.

We have been giving billions away in order to help the corporations and financial institutions create jobs, but they are not doing that. We're giving the money away as a way of making sure productivity increases, as a way of maintaining good jobs, possibly increasing them, and they're not doing it.

And Mr. Drummond is saying we should focus on productivity. There are other ways of doing it—not job creation, but other ways of helping the corporations and financial institutions to help with productivity levels that are so incredibly low. It's the job of governments to say to the corporations and to the financial institutions, "You have a responsibility on your own to make sure we maintain manufacturing jobs, create manufacturing jobs and good-paying jobs; make a commitment to job security."

That's what the Germans do. That is why they're so good at it. They have a commitment of job security and a commitment to work: manufacturing jobs that keep people employed. And it keeps people employed even in recessionary periods. They don't fire their workers; they maintain their workers. Germans understand the value of maintaining good and strong workers in the workplace. Not only are they working and buying and earning an income; it keeps the economy going. They are not laid off. German governments make up the difference between the days they lose with a differential in pay so that they remain employed in recessionary periods.

What the fundamentalists do, what the Tories and Liberals are doing, is fire them. What the Liberals are prepared to do, contrary to what McGuinty said a couple of years back, is that they are prepared to make severe cuts, cuts that will compound our debt levels and will make our economic situation worse. Even the IMF understands—the International Monetary Fund; this is one conservative organization run by the fundamentalists in America. Even they understand that we create a spiral when you make, as governments, such strong cuts that lay off workers. We make them unemployed. We make them collect welfare, meaning it costs more to governments. They are not purchasing, because they have less purchasing power, and what we are doing is creating an economy that is worse than where we find it.

I am a bit worried about where the Liberals might be going, although they're quite hush about what they're going to do. Monsieur McGuinty is waiting to see what the public has to say. He's taking a little bit of cover. He's waiting for a little bit, until the finance minister brings forth his budget. He said to his caucus, "Boys, don't say very much"—

**Ms. Tracy MacCharles:** Boys?

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:**—"and girls. Don't say very much. Let's put this out. Drummond has done his report. Let Mr. Drummond speak. The other four people who were part of the commission: Let them just be there; don't let them speak—just Drummond, which he has done. Then let this report go out and speak for itself. Then make sure that, through our Liberal contacts in whatever newspapers we control"—or not control, really—"where we have friends, there are strong articles by Liberal friends and other Conservative friends to say that what Drummond has produced is the best thing, the most miraculous report, that has ever been produced," as a way of saying, eventually, through Mr. McGuinty, the Premier, that we've got to make these cuts. "These experts are saying we've got to make these cuts, and the public is saying, 'Oh, man, if we don't do this, we're the way of Greeks. We can't let that happen; no.'"

I remember so well when we were in power in 1990 and we had a deficit. We used to have Tories and Liberals scream. I remember Chris Stockwell saying, "We don't have a revenue problem; we have a spending problem." I hear the Tories say the same thing today, and I hear some Liberals saying that today.

I remember Bob Rae, the then-leader of the NDP, so influenced by the corporate sector, by the financial institutions. They were saying at the time—they even showed us a clip from New Zealand saying, "We have hit the debt wall. Lordy, Lordy, Lordy, we have hit the debt wall, and if we don't make cuts now, today, we are in serious financial trouble." And lo and behold, it didn't take much to start talking about cuts that we had to make. Boy, was he influenced by the same people who are trying to influence the Liberals in this scenario.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** Where was your voice in all this?

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Oh yes, John, because I see you have a lot of clout with the Premier. I can see that, Minister Gerretsen. I can see that he's probably having a lot of coffees with the Premier on a daily basis, a cappuccino on College, talking about what he shouldn't do. That's how much influence he has—with all due respect, of course.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** I told you to be quiet about that, Rosie. You promised.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** It's the Premier and the chief of staff who have the power; you know that, and all the Liberal backbenchers know it. That's why they're grumpy. And even ministers are grumpy, because they know where the power lies. So where are you, Mr. Gerretsen, Minister, in this whole thing? I understand—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member will take his seat for a minute. I'll remind the member not to use names. It's ridings. Thank you.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** You're so right, Speaker. I was talking about the Attorney General. You're so right.

It's just that I don't think you guys have much power to influence those things. My point is, Bob Rae then was influenced tremendously, as you are being influenced right now, as you are creating, through Mr. Drummond, the scenario of a potential \$30-billion deficit.

You've got to do that, I understand that, in order to be able to say eventually to the public, "These are the cuts we have got to make. Otherwise, if we don't do that, we are heading the way of Greece." You've heard that argument. I know that some of you wouldn't say that, because so many of you are so smart. You wouldn't say that, but you allow others to be the foil for the things that you will do eventually.

We haven't done so well in this regard. We have not tied corporate tax cuts to job creation. That's what New Democrats said during this election. We are supportive of giving support to corporations that create jobs, that give us job guarantees. If you create jobs over the long term, you have support. We think this is a correct policy. China has been doing it for quite some time. Contrary to the Washington fundamentalists who say that should not be the case, the Chinese have been investing in areas where they believe jobs will be created, and they control that.

**Mr. Grant Crack:** A dollar an hour?

**0930**

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** They control that. They control the investments.

Some Liberals look quizzically at the statement. They—we Canadians—are so lucky that China is doing so well that they should want our resources, at whatever price, it seems, to the corporations who love to send our jobs away to them at a dollar an hour.

What we need is a commitment in this country to keep jobs here. What we need are corporations who have an obligation to Canada and to Ontario to keep the manufacturing jobs here and not send them away for a profit—for their profits, for their shareholders' profits—that gives very little to the little person who's worried about making ends meet, to the little person who's struggling to

pay the mortgages on housing prices that have gone through the roof.

Debt levels for individuals have increased in proportion to their wages. They have gone to levels that we never dreamed of. The debt levels of homeowners have skyrocketed, yet shareholders' profits have skyrocketed too, it seems. The profits of the CEOs, the financial institutions—they are doing well, and that money is not trickling down; it never does.

That's why we can't give our money away willy-nilly. That's why we say that if you're going to give money, tie it to jobs. Those are important incentives that we can give. Those are governmental regulations and governmental strengths that we have that will maintain jobs in this province. I'm all for that.

So this little measure, Bill 11, is a good little measure. We are talking \$20 million a year. It's not a bad thing; it's a good thing. We're not talking about huge amounts of money, but it's still a very useful thing to do as a way of helping different regions of Ontario.

Here are some of the concerns that I have with respect to the bill. The job guarantees are a real concern. The past Liberal job creation programs have been weak in this regard, and until we see the actual language used in the contracts, we don't know if the promised job guarantees are strong enough. This is one of the first arguments we make.

The civil servants who talked to us about this particular bill said, "We will create job guarantees." I take them at their word, and I will take that to mean the Liberal government is committed to making sure that there are job guarantees. Thus far, I have not seen anything that you Liberals have done to have worked.

Is this commitment toward job guarantees, as we release this \$20 million a year—given the take-up, if there is a take-up. Will the government put in this commitment that there will be job guarantees? I am not sure.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** Absolutely.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** It is why, Attorney General, I said that thus far, you have all failed so miserably as it relates to so many parts of Ontario where we have seen these failures. The Attorney General says, "No, absolutely," and that's what I would expect you to say.

We had a commitment from the civil servants, when we met with them about three and a half months ago, that they would send us the language. Thus far, we have not received it, as you might imagine and as you probably would expect. That is the history. What they tell you in a little gathering, however nice they are, when they go back to the political leaders saying, "They requested this; we said we would or we could, as civil servants"—once you've done that, the politicians are going to tell you, "No, you can't. You won't do that. No, you can't do that." And, as would be the case, we haven't yet seen any language. Will we ever see it? I don't know. But that is one of the concerns that we have raised with staff and that we raise here in this Legislature today.

So the first concern was, \$20 million is not a pile of money, but better than nothing; the second was job guar-

antees. The third is that the southwestern fund is being financed by reallocations from other programs within the Ministry of Economic Development and Innovation.

That's a problem for me. What it means is that we take money from an existing fund and put it in another fund and we make it appear that it's a new fund, that this is a new program. It's not the case. These are offsets. I love these words, because they mean absolutely nothing to people until they understand it. "Offsets" means that you take from one pot, put it in another pot, you call it new, and lo and behold, to the public we say, "New money for western Ontario." It's not new money: We simply rob different pockets of funding from different areas, and in particular this one is the strategic jobs and investment fund. There are probably two or three other funds that they steal money from, but this is the biggie. And I believe the strategic jobs and investment fund is a good one; I really do.

So we could have continued to fund some development in Ontario through that fund, but what we do is create a western Ontario development fund and we call it new, because it helps. It helps the politics of it; it helps the government in power. It makes it appear like they're going to be leveraging huge amounts of money—which they do, by the way. Some study has indicated that when you created this in eastern Ontario, this \$20 million a year generates \$487 million in leveraging dollars, which is a good thing. You put some money up front, it leverages dollars from other areas and it creates jobs. It's a good thing. My point is, if you already have that money working in some other program, just taking it and moving it somewhere else—I don't know, right?

**Mr. Grant Crack:** The program doesn't work now.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Oh, no, no; it does. It does, member from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell—a big riding. That's where you may have been wrong—if I heard you correctly, because my hearing gets complicated as I get older. By the way, you are continuing with the eastern Ontario development fund; that continues.

**Mr. Grant Crack:** Because it works.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Ah. No, but we didn't oppose it. Are you following my arguments? We didn't oppose it, right? Okay. So we're now doing the same in another part of the province, at the other extreme. All I'm saying is, you're taking money from an existing pot.

**Mrs. Teresa Piruzza:** It makes sense.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** It makes sense; right. It makes sense; okay. So that's the third concern that I raised.

The other one is that we argue that both of these funds, both the eastern and western funds, should have independent boards. Member from Glengarry, what do you think? It seems like you're going to be speaking for the two minutes—because I see him taking notes. You're taking notes. I can tell when somebody is about to do a two-minuter.

**0940**

We argue they should have independent boards. Implicitly and explicitly, I would think that you would

agree. The whole idea of having independent boards is so that they are responsible and would be responsible for approving funded projects. This is how it's done in northern Ontario heritage. You know that, right? Yes. And you probably agree with that, right?

**Hon. Michael Gravelle:** I wasn't listening to everything you said. My ears perked up.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Exactly. You have an independent board that manages the northern Ontario heritage fund; right. There's a logic to it. The idea is that they decide where the funds go, on the basis of some objectivity. We can never eliminate objectivity altogether, because the people you appoint could be either Tories or Liberals and very few could probably be New Democrats, but the objectivity will never been terminated. But on the other hand, an independent board is less likely to be influenced by government—not entirely, but less likely.

We have a precedent. So if the northern Ontario heritage fund has an independent board, we are urging you, good Liberals—some—to establish the same kind of criteria. It would look good on you. Because if you don't do that, what you are saying is that these funds are subject to politics. They are subject to leanings, propensities, proclivities by those in power. At the moment, it just so happens that it's you, but if it were the Tories, they would do the same. So we're saying that, to eliminate political influence by the Premier or the minister or the local members, it would be preferable to have an independent board.

These are the four areas that we believe would improve the bill. My suspicion is, you're not going to do any one of those things. I have an inkling. I could be wrong. Sometimes my sense is that you might take one or two of the suggestions as a way of saying, "You see? We listened." The jobs guarantee promise: You might do that, but I await the result of that, but I don't know whether it will happen.

So, this bill: not so bad. There are some problems. It could be improved, but the arguments I make are very valid, and I would hope that some Liberals would listen to the arguments that I put forth.

I remind the government that what New Democrats have promised in this election is that we should stop the corporate tax giveaways. It's a big gravy train, as I hope I indicated in my arguments earlier, but we would stop that gravy train. Rob Ford understands gravy trains. Hopefully, Liberals understand that this is one of the biggest gravy trains that we have ever established, that we have given so much more than Liberals could ever dream of, because I know that half of you are divided on this. The other half, the Conservatives over there, think it's a good idea, but the other half believes that where you have gone and where you're heading is wrong.

Many Liberals, I know, understand that Ontario, compared to American jurisdictions, stands at a much, much lower rate of corporate taxes, and I think that's something that you need to listen to and that I think some of you understand. When you look at the chart of the com-

bined corporate tax rates for selected US states and Ontario, Michigan, with a combined tax rate, is at 38.2%. New York is at a combined rate of 36.1%. Ontario is at 28.5%. Pennsylvania is at 37.8%. The Great Lakes weighted average is 36.6%.

The point of these numbers is that it shows that our tax rates are very low. They're incredibly competitive. They should not go any lower. You Liberals and we, the public, need those billions of dollars that you have given away, that you plan to give away. We need them to deal with the deficit that the recession has left us and that many of you have left us because of your policies. You need to stop that, and I'm hoping you're having those discussions.

I have a strong inkling, once again, that the Premier is likely to freeze those corporate giveaways. He has hinted at it a couple of times. The finance minister has hinted that this New Democratic idea—he wants to make it clear it's a New Democratic idea—about freezing corporate taxes is something that they're looking at. My sense is that you are looking at that. It will bring in savings. It will bring us money that we desperately need.

And then you're going to make some incredibly strong cuts to please the Tories, because you need to do that, and the fiscal conservatives in the Liberal caucus are happy to do that. Half of you are with that caucus over there, the Tory one, the Conservative one, and the other half struggles to say, "Man, I'd love to be a New Democrat when we're dealing with these problems." And I've got to tell you, if half of you thought that New Democrats could win elections, you'd come here in a hurry. I believe that very strongly.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Oh, no.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** I do.

And so I argue with you, plead with you, literally: Don't keep giving money away. We need it. It will help our economy. It will help with jobs. It will help to ease the pain that so many are suffering in Ontario. Remember that wages have pretty well flatlined since 1990. We are talking 20 years. When you take inflation into account, wages have flatlined. Our workers are not doing very well. If workers are not earning a good wage, they will not spend. If they do not spend, our economy crawls. It doesn't move. It doesn't grow. Prosperity is gone.

So I appeal to the 50% of the Liberals who might have this kind of conscience to consider the troubles our workers are facing, men and women who are struggling to make ends meet, as there is a strong appeal from the fundamentalists to get rid of middle-class jobs, unionized jobs, the very things that maintained our middle class. As they appeal to erode and get rid of that class by eliminating the manufacturing, unionized jobs, I say to half of you Liberals: Don't let them do it. Don't let the Premier do that. We need to maintain those jobs. We need to make sure they have well-paying jobs as a way of making sure they have the spending power to keep our economy growing, to keep it prosperous.

I wanted to refer to the stat that I couldn't find, but I know that my mind was very correct in that. But I wanted

to say to people, “According to Stats Canada, corporate holdings of cash and similar assets reached nearly half a trillion dollars by the third quarter of 2010.” I was right on that. “Since the beginning of the recession, businesses added \$83 billion to cash holdings. No-strings-attached corporate tax cuts will only boost already astronomical cash holdings levels.” This is Toby Sanger, an economist, who said that. There are a lot of economists who are very worried about where we are headed, and I think we need to listen to them. We have to worry about the direction we are going in, and the direction that Premier McGuinty is headed in is the wrong one.

It is my hope that there will not be cuts that will throw people out of work. You have already begun that process. You have quietly fired thousands of civil servants. I hope that doesn't continue, because it's not good for working men and women. I hope that the program cuts you have in mind will not lay off or fire people, because that will hurt our economy even more. I'm hoping that the kinds of things that you will consider in that Drummond report will make our economy and our government function more efficiently without the loss of jobs. And where you do that as a government, you will have my support. If we make governments more efficient while we keep our employees where they are, that's a good thing. But if you're firing people, laying off people, that, in my view, is a huge problem, and it would be an idiotic mistake for this government to make.

0950

So, Speaker, I want to wind up. I think I've covered most of the thoughts or most of the issues that I wanted to raise. I've raised my concerns about Bill 11. Some of it, I think, the Liberals might want to take into consideration, which I hope they do. Most of them I think will be rejected, but we made, I think, a good attempt at raising some of the problems that this bill has brought forward. Merci beaucoup.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate?

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** No, no; questions and comments.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments? You're at your seat now?

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Yes, I am.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Wait a minute, here. We seem to have a—are we ready now? Questions and comments?

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** A pleasure to respond to the address from the member for Trinity–Spadina this morning.

He talked a lot about friendships, and so many times he's given me that sign that we are inextricably linked here, but there are times that we seem to be on opposite sides of the scale. But in this one, we do agree that we're both going to vote against this bill because of the myriad problems and ineffective inefficiencies.

**Interjection:** That's not what he said.

**Mrs. Liz Sandals:** Yak, you weren't listening. He said he's supporting it.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Oh, is he going to—are you supporting it? Yesterday, you guys were against it. Yesterday, the NDP were speaking against the bill when they were doing their questions and comments, so we're not really sure what they're doing.

But I'll tell you one thing: Every time I see this government bring in a piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, it clearly follows one mantra: What are the political considerations and what is best in furthering the goals of the McGuinty government in being re-elected and systematically picking off stakeholders here and stakeholders there?

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Order. Could I please ask the members to show some respect and have a little order? I can't even hear the speaker who's talking. Thank you.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I could hardly hear myself.

It fits into their mantra of continuously doing things for political reasons. And you know what? Ontario is in a different world today. You've got to stop acting on that basis. You've got to actually stand up over there, take the bull by the horns and do the things that are right for this province and its people. The political games should be over; you've got to stop playing them over there. This problem is far too big for you to keep behaving like that in that fashion.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments? The member from—oh, the minister. Sorry.

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** Thank you very much—and the member from London West. I want to thank the member from Trinity–Spadina for his comments.

The approach here is pretty simple, isn't it? The bill really represents an opportunity for the people of southwestern Ontario to get some assistance to partner with each other, with a little bit of financial assistance, to create jobs and economic growth. It is an area that has been hit by the world economic recession and the downturn in the auto industry. We need some assistance down there.

I've been to a couple of the consultation meetings, and we've had people from a lot of ridings held by members on the opposite side of the House, in the opposition, turn up at those meetings and say, “We'd appreciate some financial assistance from this fund. We've got some good ideas to create jobs.” Our communities, like Strathroy, like Wallaceburg, like the Haldimand area, like St. Thomas, like Chatham, they're all down there saying, “We see a real opportunity here.”

The real question for the people on the opposite side of the House, the opposition, is: Are they prepared to support jobs in those communities, like Strathroy, Wallaceburg, Sarnia and Chatham?

I'm really looking forward to working with the members from the NDP on how to make sure that this is as strong as possible, make sure that this bill is as good as possible, make sure that this bill is as good as possible, make sure that we can deliver jobs and economic oppor-

tunity and optimism for the people in a region that has been hard hit and is looking for a little bit more assistance.

I don't think it's going to wash if the members of the opposition say no to southwestern Ontario. I don't think it's going to wash in Strathroy or Wallaceburg or Clinton or Sarnia or Chatham. I don't think they're going to be able to say they're doing nothing for jobs in that area—and get off their high horse and start supporting jobs in the southwestern Ontario region.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Rob E. Milligan:** I'd like to thank the member from Trinity–Spadina and the minister. Quite frankly, however, we have to point out that this is divisive policy by the government across the way. It's pitching one region of Ontario against another, and it's not fair. It's not fair to the voters in southwestern Ontario, western Ontario, eastern Ontario or northern Ontario. This is one province. This kind of politics needs to stop.

We understand that businesses are the backbone of the economy here in Ontario. We support small businesses, business growth, business development, not just in southwestern Ontario, eastern Ontario, northern Ontario, but Ontario as a whole, collectively. If this province needs to get its strong footing back, put ourselves back in the place where we should be, as the economic engine of Confederation in the great nation of Canada, we need to start looking at this as a whole, not region against region. The time for politics is over. We need to move forward. We need to move past this. We need to be progressive.

We are supportive of businesses, business initiatives, helping businesses with tax cuts that are going to create and retain jobs here in Ontario—not just southern Ontario, western Ontario, northern Ontario, eastern Ontario, but Ontario as a whole, collectively. It's important. The divisive politics—this is enough. It's over. The government needs to realize—we need to work together as opposition, as well as our NDP members—that we need to work collaboratively to ensure that businesses stay here, that we don't have another Caterpillar on our hands.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments? The member from Essex.

**M. Taras Natyshak:** Monsieur le Président, merci, finalement. Et merci à mon collègue, le député de Trinity–Spadina, pour ses commentaires courageux, vraiment—courageous in that he's not bound by the constraints of the big banks, as he mentioned, of the insurance companies, who seem to be dictating policy that comes from the other side. What he proposes, I think, is the Ontario tragedy in reference to what's happening in Greece—the road that we are going down, the road paved by successive Liberal and Conservative regimes, and a cautionary tale to not go down that road.

There are models that have bucked the trend. I would point to Iceland, who did not buckle under the pressure of the IMF, who did not slash and burn their social programming, who actually said, “No, we're going to do it differently. We're going to maintain those fundamental

pillars of our society.” Lo and behold, they've come out of the recession, come out of the crisis, with a 7% unemployment rate, an economy that's bolstered by social programming and a decent quality of life.

This program in the bill, I think, references—and here we are in 2012, and we are finding out that the government wants to pay attention to southwestern Ontario, finally. Why not 20 years ago when the effects of the free trade agreement, NAFTA, and deregulation were playing their role in the erosion of manufacturing jobs? So let's ensure that Chatham, yes, requires support, but that we don't have another Navistar on our hands, where a company leaves town with money in hand, laughing all the way to the bank.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate? Oh, sorry—two-minute response.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Is there another turn?

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Two-minute response.

1000

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** I listened—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Sorry, there's a problem here. Mr. Marchese is supposed to respond. We've had our four rotations. Mr. Marchese, please.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Very helpful there, Attorney General.

Speaker, I don't agree with my Conservative friends: the member from Renfrew–Nipissing or the member from Northumberland–Quinte. I understand what they are saying, but Ontario is a big province. It is not easy to administer politics from one central area, which is usually Toronto, and I'm not knocking Toronto, because I'm from here and I love Toronto. But it's hard to run everything from Toronto. Ontario is three times bigger than Italy. Italy has 56 million; we have 13-plus. It's a big territory.

All I argued—and you will know that there was already a fund in eastern Ontario, and it continues. They haven't taken that away, just in their defence, and now they are creating a western, and we have a northern Ontario fund. So most of the regions are being taken care of in a local way. All I have raised in terms of all the arguments I made—and some of them were longer, and I don't have time—is to say, look, there are a couple of things you've got to do. We need job guarantees, so we need to look at the language to make sure you've got that, because we haven't seen good results coming out of some of your policies so far in this regard.

The other one is that we need independent boards. If you have an independent board, it deals with what the Tories and New Democrats are saying, and that is that there should be no political favouritism by the minister or anybody else. I don't see why you can't create independent boards. The program is a good idea, but if you have an independent board, you then take away the opposition from the opposition parties, because once you've done that, then you deal with many of the problems that we

have raised. If you can do that, we think you will have improved Bill 11.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate?

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** I'm very pleased to speak about this bill because I've lived with the eastern Ontario development fund in eastern Ontario for the last seven or eight years that it's been operating, and it is a great program. Let's take all the politics out of this and let's just see how all of this started. Let's just see how all of this started.

There used to be an eastern Ontario development fund to help rural eastern Ontario, because all of the development was taking place in the GTA, and that program was cancelled during the Mike Harris years, in the late 1990s.

Okay. So what happens next? I'll tell you what happened next. The eastern Ontario wardens, who are the leaders of all of the various municipalities in eastern Ontario, got together and basically said, "How do we get economic development going with some government support in eastern Ontario?" It was their idea. It was the eastern Ontario wardens—all of you have been at their various meetings—that actually came up with this idea back in 2003-04.

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** I would ask the member to get in his seat if he wants to make comments.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** They had this great idea of this fund. We adopted it—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Minister, I'm still standing. Thank you.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** The government adopted this as a program back in about 2003-04, and basically the way it's set up is this way: It's an \$80-million program. Now, the Tories will say we didn't spend the entire \$80 million, and that may be true. I believe we spent about \$55 million of it during a four-year period of time, but it's better than nothing that would have been spent during your period of time.

There have been about 60 different loans made across eastern Ontario, and it's all been administered by the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade. There is a woman in the Kingston area, Rita Byvelds, who is the administrator of the program and who has done an excellent job. And who does she work with? Well, she works with the individual smaller companies that are looking for some sort of a loan idea in order to expand and create jobs. This is all about creating jobs. Rather than taking this political attitude of, "We're against it," etc., I've been to some of your ridings and made those announcements. And who was there? Your own members were there. Steve Clark was there in Brockville when I made an announcement.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Minister, when I stand up, you're supposed to stop talking.

Secondly, I'll ask you again: Use ridings, not names.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Leeds—Grenville.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Thank you very much.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** Okay, the member from Leeds—Grenville was there and he thought it was a great idea that this cable company in Brockville got some support.

How does the program work? Let's talk about how the program works. The program basically gives about a 10% top-up to the investment that is going to be made by a local company to expand. What does the company have to do for that 10% top-up? They have to create a minimum of 10 additional jobs, and that is what has been happening.

Who are the main proponents of this? The economic development officers in each and every one of your communities; they are the people who are driving the process. They work with the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, and they approve the applications. I can tell you there has been very little, if any, political involvement in actually approving the applications. I know that for an absolute fact.

In my own community of Kingston, there have been some excellent small companies, high-tech companies, that have benefited from this program and that have created the new jobs. Let me just mention a few of them.

MetalCraft is a company that makes emergency boats—fire boats and rescue boats etc.—that are literally being sold all over the world. About 10 or 15 years ago, they were a company of about five or 10 people; right now they employ something like 150 people in high-tech jobs. They wanted to expand a number of years ago, but they needed a little bit of government help to actually make that expansion go, and we basically said, as a government, here is—I can't remember the exact amount, but it seems to me it was about \$500,000 or \$600,000. They created the additional jobs and as a result of that, that company has grown, and it's providing tremendous employment for people in my community and in the adjacent communities. Sometimes it goes to a particular riding, but it doesn't really go to the riding. The people that work there come from all over the place.

Let me mention a number of other companies in the few minutes that I've got left. Bombardier; yes, Bombardier got a loan to basically come up with the new high-tech vehicle that's needed for the future. They created a minimum of 20 to 30 jobs with the amount of money that they got a while ago.

George A. Wright and Son—what does George A. Wright and Son do? They're a company in Kingston that's been around for about 100 years that make tool and die operations. They are expanding that particular business. They are creating new jobs.

We have Eikon. Eikon is a tattoo manufacturing organization. They don't actually do tattoos but they basically make the machinery that is necessary to create tattoos, which they now supply all over the world. Now, you may or may not like tattoos but, I'll tell you, it's an expanding business. They went from an operation of about two or three people that worked out of the back of

their garage into an operation that now employs, in making this tattoo machinery, about 50 or 60 people. That's all good economic development.

There's GS Solutions. I mentioned Centennial Global Technology; they manufacture solar panels. Small, little companies started in a small, little location, at one time hired about 20 or 30 people; right now close to 100 people work there. How did they get that way? In part because of the economic opportunities that were provided to them under the eastern Ontario economic development fund.

These are just some examples. I think there have been about 60 loans in eastern Ontario. There have been well over 2,000 to 3,000 jobs created as a result of that. They are good programs.

So what are we doing with this good program? We're basically saying, "Okay, southwestern Ontario, you've got your own issues, issues that are separate from the kind of economic issues that we have in the GTA. We are going to give some help to the companies that want to expand there."

This isn't a corporate giveaway. Companies have to show that they've actually hired additional people as a result of this loan. The money isn't just being given away to them.

All I would suggest to the people on the other side—and I know it may be a little bit difficult, particularly for the Conservative members from eastern Ontario, many of whose ridings have companies in them that are high-tech companies that have benefited. Because of the politics involved, you may not want to approve this. You may just want to absent yourself from the House that day, because I can tell you, when you go back and talk to eastern Ontario wardens—and I know many of you, particularly those of you of a municipal background, have got a close connection with these people—they may not like the position that you're taking if you vote against a continuation of this program.

We insisted—the members from eastern Ontario—that this program has been so successful over the last four years that we want it to continue. That's why this is sort of a double-jointed bill; on the one hand, we want to set up the southwestern Ontario economic development fund, but we want the eastern Ontario development fund to continue.

Now, I've heard the member opposite talk about setting up a separate board and a this and a that, and who would appoint the people to these boards. That is not where the decisions are made. The decisions are made by the economic development officers, working in conjunction with the economic development ministry folks, to determine what are the good applications that will actually lead to job creation opportunities as a result of these grants being handed out to these corporations.

I can tell you without any doubt at all that this has been a great program for eastern Ontario. Many communities have benefited from it. They're all about only one thing, and that is creating more jobs. I can tell you from a practical experience, it's happened in my com-

munity and it's happened in every other community in eastern Ontario, because these loans have not just been handed out in Liberal ridings; there are just as many in so-called Conservative ridings, or whatever. They are all determined by the strength of the application that the individual company puts forward and by the amount of money that they themselves are willing to put into it—because for the capital investment to take place, the companies themselves have to come up with 85% to 90% of the money.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** So what's the problem with an independent board? I don't get it.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** Well, you don't need an independent board. You're just making it more—

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** So make me happy.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** I would ask that the members go through this party and not talk directly to each other. They're veterans; they should know better. Thank you.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** Speaker, I just simply want to—I know I get a little bit excited about this particular program, because it has worked so well. It has worked extremely well. It has worked well in Brockville; it's worked well in Northumberland; it's worked well in Prince Edward-Hastings, in the Belleville area; it's worked well in the Pembroke area; it's worked well all over eastern Ontario. We've got a map to show you where all of the various grants have been made to these companies.

These are all small companies that want to expand, but they want a little bit of help. What they have to put up is a guarantee of X number of jobs—10 jobs or more—for every application. It's a great program and anybody that would vote against this program, particularly if you're from eastern Ontario or from southwestern Ontario, you are not doing your communities any good by doing so. I would strongly suggest to the Conservative members that they really rethink this.

This idea came from the eastern Ontario wardens; many of your buddies are there. Many of your communities have benefited from them. Please do not vote against your communities' best interests. Thank you.

*Second reading debate deemed adjourned.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Due to the fact that we're close to 10:15, this House stands adjourned until 10:30.

*The House recessed from 1013 to 1030.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** In the west members' gallery today, I'd like to introduce Jenn Hartman and her husband, David Smith. Jenn is the co-chair of the Campaign for Pediatric Ophthalmology at McMaster Children's Hospital. They're trying to create the province's largest centre of excellence for specialized pediatric eye care. I welcome them to Queen's Park.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Welcome.

**Mr. Reza Moridi:** Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce His Excellency Ali Riza Guney, consul general of the Turkish Republic, at the Speaker's gallery.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** We welcome our guest.

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** I'd like to welcome, in the members' gallery, from the Ontario Harness Horse Association, Jim Whelan, the director, along with Brian Tropea, Kathryn Tropea and Jojo Chintoh.

Speaker, also with us today is Jody Jamieson. He's a horse owner and driver. Jody is a two-time and reigning world driving champion of this current year.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** We welcome our guests.

**Mr. Bill Mauro:** I'd like to welcome to the assembly today, sitting in the members' east gallery, an old friend of mine from Thunder Bay, Peter Buchan. Peter is here today to watch his son, David Buchan. David is, I think, the page captain today. I don't see David here right now, but I know he's here, and I'd like to welcome them both to Queen's Park.

**Mr. Jim McDonell:** Speaker, I'd like to introduce Joanne Haley and her sister Heather Stang. They're here to see Joanne's son Ryan, who is a page here today.

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** I'd like to introduce Heide Hochgeschurz, who is the grandmother of page Katelyn Hochgeschurz. She is in the public gallery.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I'm delighted to welcome Marilyn Heinz from Burlington to the Legislature today. Welcome, Marilyn.

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** It's a great honour for me to introduce Mr. Zhengfei Chen, father of Judy Zhengfei, from Toronto Centre, who is one of our pages. They're in the gallery behind me—her parents. I'd like to welcome them.

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** It's my pleasure to introduce Mr. Rashad Vahed, in the members' gallery. He is the father of page Marium Vahed and a very good and old friend of the member for Ottawa Centre. I'd like to welcome them to Queen's Park.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** It's my pleasure to introduce, in the members' west gallery, the former member from Brant in the 32nd and 33rd Parliaments, Phil Gillies. Welcome, Phil.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Never mind.

I have two introductions to do, so I'll start with this one. In the press gallery today, we have visiting journalism students from Sheridan College. I, like you, will remind them not to listen to everything that they're told by the people up there. Anyway, they are here at Queen's Park today to be shadowing and learning from the Queen's Park reporters.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Today we have—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Hence my pre-  
amble.

Today we have Katie Breen, Brent Brown, Benjamin Carter, Melissa Dapaah, Mackenzie Fowler, Amanda Galbraith, James Garcia, Justin Grant, Emily Johnson, Matthew Koehl, Michael McBride, Brian Oliver, Michael Owusu, Natalie Rutherford, Danny Schertzer, Ashley Stennett, Colin Van Ooyen, Stefano Vito and Riley Welch. Welcome.

## LEGISLATIVE PAGES

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** And now if I could have our pages assemble for introduction. This, by the way, is what I consider to be a very good tradition that we started with the previous Speaker, and deserving.

I would ask the members to join me in welcoming this group of pages serving in the first session of our 40th Parliament:

David Buchan from Thunder Bay—Atikokan; Judy Chen from Toronto Centre; William Cooper from St. Catharines; Michael Davidson from Ottawa Centre; Shirley Fan from Markham—Unionville; Grace Glennie from Whitby—Oshawa; Ryan Haley from Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry; Katelyn Hochgeschurz from Carleton—Mississippi Mills; Jason Huang from Willowdale; Adrian Hucal from Hamilton East—Stoney Creek; Mackenzie Hulme from Algoma—Manitoulin; William Hume from Ajax—Pickering; Samantha Mariano from Vaughan; James Newman from Scarborough—Guildwood; Kriti Ravindran from Richmond Hill; Ryan Ripsman from Thornhill; Rachel Rynard from Simcoe North; Sophia Sengfah from Bramalea—Gore—Malton; Marium Vahed from Mississauga—Streetsville; Patrick Williams from Dufferin—Caledon; Darren Yanni from Sault Ste. Marie; Ruby Yee from Barrie; and, for the sake of Phil Gillies, Grace Zhou from Brant. Welcome. Reassemble.

It is now time for oral questions.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### PUBLIC SERVICES

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** My question is to the Premier: Yesterday, you weighed in on the Toronto transit issue, saying that the time for talk is coming to an end. The vote, I remind you, on Toronto transit was two weeks ago. However, we have now been 20 weeks since a provincial election campaign. You've had the Drummond report for some six weeks. I'm worried that you're setting a bit of a double standard here.

So, Premier, by your own standards, if two weeks takes too much time for debate, I'll ask you, why aren't you bringing forward your plan to finally reduce the size and cost of government? Will you table it today?

*Interjection.*

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, I welcome the question—and the enthusiasm from my colleague in the Ottawa area.

We've made it clear that we will be providing our answer to Drummond through our budget, to be delivered in this Legislature at the usual time. What we're doing with this valuable period, of course, is listening to Ontarians. We're very hopeful that shortly we will strike a legislative committee that will take responsibility for giving full consideration to the Drummond report.

1040

I'm also very open to advice being offered by my colleagues in the opposition parties. I think we have a shared responsibility to be fair and thorough and, I would argue, exhaustive in terms of addressing the significant challenge before all of us. We need to tackle that deficit. We need to strengthen health care and education, and we need to do it all at the same time.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** The Premier describes this process as "exhaustive." Frankly, Premier, it's exhausting to see you now delay for a year. It was a year ago that you appointed Mr. Drummond. You said, "We won't make any tough decisions on reining in the size and cost of government for a year." It has been 20 weeks since the election campaign. You've had the Drummond report for six weeks. It's almost like you walked into your office after Drummond said, "My goodness, who spent all this money?"

Premier, let's be serious. You've been sitting on this issue for a long period of time. The time for dithering and delay is well past us. I ask you, will you act today before we get into a deeper hole? Put your plan on the table to get our books back in balance in the province of Ontario. The time for action is now.

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Again, I appreciate my colleague's impatience, but I think responsibility, or a responsible approach to dealing with the challenge before us, demands that we take the necessary time to get a response both from the opposition parties and the public in general on the Drummond report, and a bit of consistency would be helpful in that regard.

My honourable colleague began in his initial response to the Drummond report by saying that it's important not to cherry-pick. It needs to be adopted in whole, holus-bolus. But now we hear that they stand against the recommendations connected to LHINs. They stand against the recommendations connected to horse racing. They stand against the recommendations connected to the approach we need to bring to doctors' compensation, and they stand against a competitive process for school busing in rural Ontario. Those were all specific recommendations in there. First he says, "Buy the whole thing." Now he's saying he has got some reservations. A bit of consistency would be helpful.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Well, Speaker, back to the Premier: The problem is, the Premier stands in one place only, and that's paralyzed. You described this report as a "road map," but you've taken us nowhere. For a year now,

you've dug a deeper and deeper hole and not put your plan on the table.

So, with all due respect, what you describe as our "impatience for action" I simply say is prudence, and that prudence is shared by the Dominion Bond Rating Service, which, the day after Drummond, said this: "[L]ack of resolve and" drastic "efforts to significantly curb spending growth in the next budget could be a cause for increased concerns for DBRS." A lowering of our status is going to imply more interest payments on debt and challenge further our ability to provide front-line programs.

So, Premier, I'll ask again: It has been a year now. You've had the Drummond report for six weeks. Will you table your actual plan today?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, a couple of points in response to that. First of all, as Mr. Drummond and his team made abundantly clear—and I can refer my honourable colleague to the specific pages in due course. But I can tell him now that in relation to GDP, as a matter of total government spending, we're the third-lowest in Canada. In terms of our tax burden, we're the second-lowest in Canada. In terms of per capita spending, we're the lowest in Canada.

Now my colleague opposite says that we should move immediately and table our specific plan. I would argue that he needs a bit more time to develop some consistency with respect to his approach. Either we adopt it in whole or he puts forward a series of objections to specific recommendations. We await the outcome of that internal debate.

## PUBLIC SERVICES

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Back to the Premier, Speaker: It is, I will add, disturbing that the Premier continues to pat himself on the back for fiscal responsibility when he seems to be the only person, including Mr. Drummond and Mr. Jack Mintz—your adviser on some economic issues, who says that you have spent far too much money too quickly, and you seem to have no plan to get it back in balance.

The Premier has actually responded to one recommendation in the Drummond report. He said he will not follow Mr. Drummond's recommendation on full-day kindergarten. The implication to the fiscal plan is \$1.5 billion. So, Premier, I think you have a responsibility then; if you've taken that off the table, is your \$1.5 billion going to be in increased taxes or in spending reductions? You owe it to us to tell us. If that \$1.5 billion is off the table, what is your plan to replace it with something of equal value?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, we've made it perfectly clear, when it comes to full-day kindergarten, we are absolutely committed to that, come heck or high water. We think it's very important in terms of the basis for a strong economy that is built on the skills and education of our people. That's our strength. It's not oil; it's not gas; it's not the forestry; it's not the fisheries. It's

the people of Ontario. I think that's very important for us to understand together, and I'm going to invite my friend to share that.

I say to my friend, of course we will have to find alternate sources of savings, since we intend to adopt that. We've been very clear.

What I'm not sure about is where the opposition stands with respect to the Drummond report in its entirety. He says that we cannot cherry-pick, but now he says that he's against the horse-racing recommendations. He's against the recommendation in regard to doctors. He's against a number of other recommendations. So we'll give them the time in order for them to get their act together.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** A reminder again: Inside voices, please.

**Supplementary?**

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Premier, with all due respect, this is the only plan you've put on the table. If you don't like your own plan, then put forward your plan. That's what I'm asking about each and every day in question period.

Mr. Drummond did say in his report, on page 9, "Message from the Chair," that "we expect that many of our recommendations will be rejected. We accept that, but each rejected recommendation must be replaced not by a vacuum, but by a better idea—one that delivers a similar fiscal benefit." I agree with Mr. Drummond. I assume the Premier does as well.

Premier, you've backed away from \$1.5 billion in savings on full-day kindergarten, and now your education minister is backing away from eliminating the hard cap on class sizes and eliminating a number of education bureaucrats.

So, Premier, is this a new policy development, and if you are taking these recommendations off the table, where will you find the additional savings?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Again, Speaker, I think what my honourable colleague is saying is that he'd like us to present the budget here today. We don't intend to do that.

What we would like to receive is some consistency in terms of the representations being made by the opposition. The leader of the official opposition says that you can't cherry-pick from this document; you have to adopt it in its entirety. Yet, at the same time, we're hearing that they're not in favour of the LHIN recommendations. They're not in favour of those recommendations relating to horse racing in Ontario. They're not in favour of the recommendations with respect to firm but fair bargaining with Ontario doctors and the way that they receive their compensation. They're not in favour of moving towards a competitive process for busing in rural Ontario.

Again, as we work together to develop the content of our budget, it would be most helpful if we were to receive some consistency in terms of the position being adopted by the official opposition.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** You know, sadly, Speaker, in spite of the fact that I'm asking very serious and direct questions, all I'm getting back from the Premier is more Liberal talking points and no answers for taxpayers in the province of Ontario.

Let me ask you again, Premier. I've asked you where you're going to find the \$1.5 billion in savings. You have dodged that question. Your education minister is now saying you're backing away from the Drummond recommendation with respect to the hard cap on class sizes; that is \$500 million in savings. And your education minister is backing away from the Drummond recommendation to eliminate 70% of non-teaching staff; that's a further \$600 million. So your education minister now is taking an additional \$1.1 billion off the table. Combined with full-day kindergarten, that's \$2.6 billion, Premier.

Don't you have an obligation to tell us where you're going to find those savings? Are you going to increase taxes? Please tell us exactly where you stand if you're taking those three items off the table.

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, we do have an obligation, and we will respond to that in the budget. I keep saying that to my honourable colleague.

What we're looking for at this point in time is the best advice that the opposition parties, and Ontarians in general, may have to offer. So I say again: Give us your best advice. Allow us to move this work into a legislative committee so that all members can make representations and so that we can hear from the people of Ontario. The Minister of Finance will continue his pre-budget consultations. I think we all have a responsibility, as members of provincial Parliament, to hear from our own constituents and bring all that wisdom to bear on the final product. So I say to my honourable colleague, I look forward to receiving his advice.

1050

## TAXATION

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My question is to the Premier. For years, the Premier argued that corporate tax giveaways and an unfair HST were necessary if we were going to compete with other provinces like British Columbia. He claimed, in fact, that Ontario was leading the way and that BC was scrambling to catch up. My question to the Premier is: Does he still have that opinion?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, I want to commend the government of British Columbia for modelling a new initiative on our healthy homes renovation tax credit that we're trying to move forward with here in Ontario. I would appreciate my colleague's support in regard to that particular measure.

One of the things that we have committed to is, we have put forward a number of principles which will inform our approach that we're going to take in dealing with our deficit. We said we're going to protect health care and education. We're going to reject across-the-board cuts. We've insisted that reforms must get better

value for money by improved efficiency and greater productivity. I say again to my honourable colleague that we've also specifically said no to tax increases. We will not be taking money out of an economy we're trying to get going. Finally, we will not pursue austerity measures that hurt the economy. Those are the principles that will guide us.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** As the Premier knows, British Columbia abandoned the HST last year, and yesterday BC's Minister of Finance announced that they're prepared to raise the corporate tax rate to help fight the deficit in that province. Now, the fact is that even the Liberals in BC are realizing that they've invested enough in corporate tax giveaways and that it's actually time to start looking at other options.

Is the Premier going to start waking up to that reality any time soon, or does he plan to continue to stand arm in arm with Mr. Flaherty and Mr. Harper to the bitter, bitter end?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** I don't know if that's unparliamentary, Speaker, but I think it's on the line.

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Bordering, bordering.

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** I think it's bordering.

My honourable colleague has been nothing if not consistent in terms of her desire to raise taxes. One of the things she has been advocating, for example, is that we, at a minimum, freeze corporate taxes. Let's consider that, if you will, for just a moment.

If we were to do that, that would save us \$800 million. We need to save \$16 billion. So that proposal represents 5% of the solution. I've heard from my honourable colleague with respect to the first 5%, but what I'd ask her, on behalf of Ontarians, is: What do we do to solve the next 95% of the problem?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Gee, Speaker, if he took my advice earlier, it would maybe be closer to \$20 billion in tax giveaways that he's given out already, but that's beside the point.

For three years, the Premier has promised Ontario families that tax giveaways to corporations were going to create jobs in Ontario, and for three years people have continued to watch good jobs leave Ontario. We've been more than competitive with other jurisdictions, with other provinces—more than 10 points lower in our corporate tax rate than the Great Lakes states—but that simply has not solved our problem in terms of jobs. We continue to see jobs leave the province.

Is the Premier finally ready to admit that the jobs plan that he has been trying to sell Ontarians simply isn't getting people back to work?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, we've gained some 300,000 jobs since the depth of the recession. We've more than made up for the jobs that we've lost. Last year, I believe we gained some 121,000 more jobs. We continue to create more jobs in Ontario than any other province, of course.

My honourable colleague, I know, is wed to the concept of taxes. As I said specifically, if we hold the line on corporate taxes and we don't proceed with the next reduction, that saves us \$800 million. We have a \$16-billion challenge. Eight hundred million dollars is only 5% of the solution. So again I say to my honourable colleague: What about the remaining 95%? We'd love to hear, and I'm sure Ontarians would want to hear, about a comprehensive, thorough plan to address a \$16-billion deficit.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, I can't account for the folly of the Premier's ways over the last couple of years with his commitment to corporate tax cuts that haven't gotten us anywhere, but nonetheless, my next question is to the Premier.

In November 2010, the Ministry of Health informed MPPs on the Standing Committee on Estimates that an operational review of Ornge had just been completed. Somehow, this review didn't flag any of the problems that have since been found at Ornge.

My question is a very simple one: Will the Premier have the minister table that review that she spoke of at estimates to the public today?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Health.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you to the member opposite for the question.

You know, I think the people of Ontario have three questions they want answers to. The first one is: If someone I love, or even if I, need an air ambulance, will it be there for me? The answer to that is: Absolutely, yes. Ontario has one of the finest air ambulance services in the world, and it continues to strengthen.

The second question that people have is: What did you do when you discovered there was a problem at Ornge? Speaker, the answer to that is that I sent in a forensic audit team. I told them to follow the public money. I replaced the CEO, replaced the entire board at Ornge. I worked co-operatively with the Auditor General and, in fact, I have asked the Auditor General to release his report as quickly as he can under section 17.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Well, Speaker, I thought it was a pretty simple question, which is: Would the minister make available for review today the report that they spoke of back in 2010 in November? I certainly didn't hear an answer to that question.

Last summer, in response to a freedom-of-information request, the Ministry of Health confirmed that they possessed documents at that time concerning Dr. Chris Mazza's salary at Ornge—but they refused to release those documents. Can the minister make those documents public today?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Again, I want to speak to the people of Ontario. They want to know what we've done to fix the problems. We appointed a forensic audit team. They had a team of over 30 people working for

several weeks. They submitted an interim report which led me to the very unhappy conclusion that it was time to involve the Ontario Provincial Police. Let me tell you, Speaker, that is a step that no minister takes lightly, but it's vitally important to get to the bottom of this, to get the facts on the table so that justice is done.

I respect the work of the Ontario Provincial Police. I want them to do a full job. They will do a thorough job, and that is vitally important.

When the new board was put in place, I gave them three instructions. The first priority has to be patient safety, and they've taken important steps in that direction. The second thing is—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, the minister is asking us to believe an unbelievable story. They've been sitting on information about Ornge that they refuse to share with a sceptical public. In November 2010, the minister dodged committee questions about Ornge, promising to look into it. Five months later, she dodged questions in the House, promising to look into it.

Now, these problems were first flagged by whistle-blowers back in 2008. In most jobs, when you tell people you're solving a problem and then you never actually do it—you never actually get to the solving of the problem—you actually don't get to keep your job. Does the minister think she should be keeping hers?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** The reason the salary information was not released was because we did not have it, and that is why we are moving forward to strengthen accountability at Ornge, to make sure this situation is fixed and does not happen again.

Speaker, we are bringing in a stronger performance agreement with Ornge. The elements of that include: that any changes to the corporate structure require the minister's approval; that all employees will be subject to the Broader Public Sector Salary Disclosure Act; and that we will have much more oversight and require much more transparency when it comes to the financial issues at Ornge. Ornge will have quality improvement requirements, just like our hospitals do; they will have a patient advocate, just like our hospitals do; we will have debt control provisions to ensure that any debt increases do not happen without approval. We're fixing the problem.

1100

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** To the Minister of Health: Speaker, we want to speak to the public as well. We want to speak to the public about what the minister has not done when it comes to the Ornge scandal.

She was first told about this in November at a committee hearing and promised to get back to members of the Legislature with responses. She didn't do anything. She was again warned, on three different occasions, in this House in April 2011. She promised to look into it; she did nothing.

On May 4, 2011, the minister received a five-page letter from the Ontario Air Transport Association listing numerous failures on the part of Ornge to comply with competitive procurement practices and—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Question?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** —“compromised patient care and created serious personnel and cost issues for hospitals.” What did she do? Nothing.

I ask the minister this—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Member.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order. Order.

Now again, I remind: When I say “answer” or “question,” you only have a few seconds to finish it. Please get to that point. When I stand, you sit down.

Minister.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, perhaps the member opposite thinks that the minute he asked a question in question period, I should've gone directly to the police. I don't agree with that. I think there was an important due diligence to follow before we got to that point—and we did that due diligence, which took us to where we are today.

The people of Ontario want to have confidence in our air ambulance service. I can tell you that yesterday, Speaker, 61 patients were transferred using air ambulance. They travelled over 30,000 kilometres, bringing people to the care they needed. The work that Ornge does is so vitally important in our health care system. It's vital that we move quickly to strengthen oversight at Ornge. That is why we're going to be introducing legislation, Speaker, that will entrench in law oversight and requirements that Ornge—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Speaker, had the minister done her job three years ago, two years ago, one year ago, there would be no need for a criminal investigation today. It's a fact that the minister didn't do her job.

Unfortunately, it's now up to whistle-blowers to provide oversight of our air ambulance service. Here's the latest report that I received just yesterday: The London helicopter was out of service four nights in a row last week because there were no pilots. The Sudbury helicopter was out of service for three of those same nights for the same reason. I have a list of 13 other incidents over the last few weeks; I'll ask a page to take them over to the minister. They deal with incidents such as this: a helicopter sent to the wrong hospital in London, resulting in a lost bed for a pediatric patient due to a three-hour delay on the part of Ornge. A London helicopter sent to Simcoe helipad that had no lights because the dispatch department didn't know it.

I ask the Premier this: Is this the kind of decisive action that you expect from your minister, or will you ask her—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Minister?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order.

Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you, Speaker. What I can tell you is that every complaint that is made when it comes to Ornge is investigated. That is a clear responsibility of Ornge.

What I can tell you: When we put the new board of directors in place at Ornge, we paid special attention to patient safety. Ian Delaney, an impeccable business leader in Ontario—internationally, actually—is the chair of Ornge. Charles Harnick is on the board. Patricia Lang is the former president of Confederation College. Dr. Barry McLellan, who's the president and CEO of Sunnybrook Hospital and an expert in trauma care, is personally taking responsibility for safety issues at Ornge. Maneesh Mehta, Speaker, is on the board—Patrice Merrin and Patricia Volker. This is a top-notch board who takes their responsibility extremely seriously, Speaker, and I have every confidence that—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** Merci, M. le Président. Ma question est pour la ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée.

I think it is now clear to anybody looking that a lack of accountability was at the heart of the province's agreement with Ornge. In 2010, in a letter to our party that was copied to the minister, Ornge justified their refusal to release executive salaries, saying they are "free from restrictions" and "able to pursue whatever business model its board deems appropriate," whether for-profit, not-for-profit. It didn't matter.

The minister has been responsible for overseeing Ornge for the last two years—overseeing the Ornge agreement as well. Is it safe to say that in her view, this agreement became unacceptable once it hit the front page of the paper?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, there is no question that with the benefit of hindsight, all of us agree that the original performance agreement was not strong enough. It did not provide the transparency and accountability that we demand today. That is why we're bringing in a new performance agreement.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Look, I'm hearing some really nice quiet while the questions are being put. It's very difficult to hear the answer. I'm asking the members on this side: Tone it down. I'd like to hear the answer, and so should you—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** You, sir, will be named the next time you do that to me. In the middle of a sentence, you speak when I'm standing? Not acceptable. Minister.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, we are developing a new performance agreement with the new leader-

ship at Ornge, because the people of Ontario demand greater transparency and greater accountability. I demand greater transparency and greater accountability. The fact that our government was stonewalled by the people at Ornge when we investigated questions and we were not provided with answers; when the Auditor General was stonewalled in his request for information; that led to this chain of events that takes us to where we are today.

The important thing, Speaker, is that we move forward with a stronger performance agreement so this—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It will be very interesting to get to the bottom of who knew what when, because in January 2011, there is a letter to your ministry from Ornge that says, and here, again, I quote: They are "seeking nothing from the government except to make it aware of what it has done and is intending to do" with their for-profit pursuit. They were telling the government that they could do whatever they wished with \$150 million that the taxpayers were giving them.

This should have raised red flags to anybody; to any minister who's doing her job. This should have raised red flags, along with everything else that had been going on: the questioning that had been going on in the House, at estimates. The letters that were piling up from Ornge saying, "We don't have to give you any information," happened in 2010.

Why, after two years of doing nothing, does the minister believe that she should keep her job?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Because, Speaker, when Ornge was established back in 2005, there was a hope, there was a dream that Ontario's world-class air ambulance service was a product that could be commercialized and sold internationally. That was what we were trying to do at that time.

In hindsight, Speaker, the accountability agreement, the performance agreement, was not strong enough, and the other component, of course, was that the leadership at Ornge—a handful of senior executives—forgot that their first responsibility was to the people of Ontario; their first responsibility was to deliver air ambulance care to people who desperately need that air ambulance service.

So that is why, going forward, we are winding down all of the for-profit entities. That is the work of the board. They are doing that as we speak.

#### JOB CREATION

**Mrs. Teresa Piruzza:** My question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Innovation.

Despite the resurgence in the auto industry and the shift toward green energy manufacturing in Windsor and Essex, people in my riding are in need of jobs. Jobs and economic development continue to be the priority. It's well documented that the unemployment rate in Windsor-Sarnia is higher than the provincial average. In January, unemployment was 9.7% compared to provincial 7.4%, and of course Windsor continues to have a very high

unemployment rate. Can the Minister of Economic Development and Innovation please explain what is being done to create jobs in southwestern Ontario, an area particularly hard hit by the recession?

1110

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** The McGuinty government recognizes the priority of job creation across the province. And we've acknowledged, as the member just said in her question, that this is a region of particular need. That's why we are committed to creating the southwestern Ontario development fund, modelled after our successful eastern Ontario development fund, which is leveraging \$500 million from the \$53 million that we've invested so far and has created and is retaining 11,700 jobs. The southwestern development fund will leverage much-needed private sector funds and create much-needed jobs in southwestern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, as the member will know, this bill's presently before the House. If passed, it will establish the southwestern development fund as a permanent economic development tool for southwestern Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mrs. Teresa Piruzza:** Speaker, I understand that thorough consultations have been taking place throughout southwestern Ontario. The meeting in Windsor was well attended and very positive. The feedback I'm hearing in my riding from my constituents is that we need jobs and the investments. They need this fund and they need it now. Can the minister assure my constituents that the southwest economic development fund is on track to be in place this spring?

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** That is my expectation, Mr. Speaker. The only thing standing in the way of those important jobs and those important investments would be if the opposition should decide not to support the bill that is before this House. And I've got to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I was a little concerned to hear the member for Lambton-Kent-Middlesex say during second reading debate yesterday—this is what he said—"My riding [has] been especially hard hit with the downturn of the manufacturing sector. My constituents are coming to me every day, asking why the McGuinty government is doing nothing to repair the economy and nothing to turn things around in southwestern Ontario and help get people back to work." Mr. Speaker, that's just wrong. The member knows we're taking action in southwestern Ontario to create jobs, to attract investment. He's got to be straight with his constituents. He and his leader are standing in the way of that important—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. The tradition of this place is not to reference anybody else when the question period is on, so I will try to remind you that you're answering the question for your colleague.

New question.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** To the Minister of Health, Speaker. There is something called the emergency health services

branch at the Ministry of Health. Can the minister tell us how many people are employed there and what their mandate is?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I will certainly be happy to get that information for the member opposite.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Speaker, this is confounding. Not only does the minister not know what is going on at Ornge; she doesn't know what's going on in her own ministry departments. Here is what the emergency health services branch does, according to the website: It is the strategic manager of the land and air ambulance system for the province of Ontario. It is responsible for ensuring the existence throughout Ontario of a balanced, seamless and integrated system of ambulance services and communication services.

I want to know this: What have the more than 100 staff, the assistant deputy minister and the deputy minister, who are responsible for this platoon of overseers, been doing while the scandal at Ornge has been brewing and why doesn't she know that they even exist?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I'm just going to let that sit. The member opposite will know that I've had meetings with that branch in particular. They have been working extremely hard throughout this whole process. In fact, it is thanks to the good work of the people at the emergency services management branch that we are developing this new performance agreement. I can tell you that the people at that branch, headed up by the very capable Patricia Lee, have been working very hard to get the information that we need. And it is thanks to them that we are where we are today, which is moving forward with a strong performance agreement, moving forward with new legislation.

I hope the member opposite will commit to supporting the new legislation that we will be introducing, which will bring transparency and oversight to Ornge.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** Mr. Speaker, through you, this question is to the Premier. The health minister claims that she knew nothing, that she heard nothing, about Ornge. We all know that this is not the case. As we've heard today, in 2008, the province was warned about this. An accountant told the province that Ornge was handing out money like water. In 2010, Howard Hampton asked the health minister: Why is it that Mr. Mazza's salary is not being disclosed? In 2011, the members of the opposition raised this issue in this House, asking the health minister to do something about what was happening at Ornge.

After the minister was repeatedly warned about this issue, how can she say that she has done her job?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I'm doing my job because I'm fixing the problems at Ornge, and that is exactly what the people of this province expect me to do.

Let's review again what it is that we're fixing. We have brought in new leadership, a new CEO and an excellent new board. We have been working with the forensic audit team, the Auditor General and now the Ontario Provincial Police. We have brought in new oversight and new safety protocols.

The most important thing is this: If someone you know, someone you love, needs an air ambulance, is it going to be there for you? And the answer to that is: Absolutely, yes. The next most important thing is: Are your taxpayer dollars being used to provide patient care? That is the issue that we gave to the forensic audit team and we have charged the Ontario Provincial Police with, and they have accepted the responsibility for that investigation. Speaker—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** Mr. Speaker, again, through you, to the Premier: How can the Minister of Health say that she has been doing her job? When she has known about this issue for at least three years, how can she say that she has been doing her job? In fact, the only thing that's transparent in this government is the lack of oversight and accountability. We know that executives at Ornge have been lining their pockets for years and we know the Minister of Health has ignored repeated warnings.

The former Minister of Health didn't get to keep his job after the eHealth scandal. Why should this minister be able to keep hers?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I have taken the responsible action every step of the way.

I do want to take this opportunity, however, to remind all people who work in health care across this province that, if they have a responsibility to provide patient care and if they are entrusted with tax dollars, they have a responsibility to remember every single day what that responsibility is. They have to remember every single day who it is they're there to serve. Very occasionally, we get someone in a leadership position who forgets that they have a fundamental, sacred responsibility to the people of this province. This is a good opportunity to remind everyone who works in health care and beyond that people are trusting you to do your job. Live up to that trust.

## RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy. Minister, Ontario's clean energy economy is helping the province to replace dirty coal-fired generation with cleaner sources of energy. Our investments in clean energy are creating jobs and cleaning up the air we breathe, ensuring that our children and grandchildren have a bright and healthy future. Our clean energy economy has also brought in \$27 billion in private sector investment and created over 20,000 jobs in the province.

The feed-in tariff review that is currently taking place is expected to build on the success of the program and to

help grow Ontario's clean energy economy. I know that my constituents are eager to see the review and learn about the enhancements to the FIT program.

Minister, can you please tell this House when the FIT two-year review will be complete?

1120

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** I want to thank the member from Ottawa—Orléans for the question. It is enormously important because we want to keep the momentum that's been generated. We believe in clean energy, clean air and clean energy jobs, so we've conducted a very extensive consultation approach. We're working as hard as we can.

I'm really hoping that toward the end of the first quarter we'll be able to speak to this in more detail, but we want to keep the momentum of those 20,000 jobs touching every part of the province. We want to keep the investment coming into the province. We want to keep protecting the health of Ontarians, generating jobs for local communities and producing a clean energy source for today, for tomorrow and for generations to come.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** Thank you, Minister. I'm looking forward to reading the review.

I know that the review is considering a wide range of issues, such as the FIT price schedule, rules around clean energy procurement, the role of new technologies in Ontario's electricity system, and the renewable approvals process. These are very important aspects of our extremely successful FIT program, and I know there's room for improvement.

Minister, my constituents are concerned that changes to the program will make an impact on both ratepayers and our clean energy economy. They would like to know what is being done to bring prices down while maintaining the necessary investments in our North-America-leading clean energy economy.

Can you please tell us what is being done to ensure that the FIT two-year review balances the interests of the Ontario consumer with the need to create jobs in our clean energy economy?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** The member has spoken very eloquently to the balance to make sure that you have a strong foundation—a strong foundation for jobs, a good amount of clean energy coming in and protection of the ratepayer.

You know, we heard from 2,900 individuals and organizations online; 130 separate submissions apart from online; over 100 meetings—a lot of good advice covering the wide spectrum. We want to make sure we have a solid foundation to grow those 20,000 jobs to 50,000, to encourage even more investment in the province of Ontario, to make sure we protect the ratepayer and to build a foundation for the next generation of innovative jobs for the future.

The world is going green. Ontario wants to be a leader. The jobs are for leaders, not followers.

## APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** My question today is for the Minister of Finance. It's no wonder the McGuinty Liberals are on track for a \$30-billion deficit. Minister, after eight painful years of Liberal mismanagement, I expect that you would like to find areas where you could eliminate waste, maintain jobs and save money.

The College of Trades is asking you for \$31 million this year so that you can continue to destroy jobs in the skilled trades and construction industry. They are doing this by creating compulsory certification of existing construction trades, no grandfathering of tradesmen in these trades and a biased review of a distorted ratio system.

When will you do what is right and scrap this looming boondoggle that you call the College of Trades?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Our government is very proud of our record of doubling the number of apprenticeships in Ontario. I can assure the member opposite that we will continue to make important investments in job skills and training. It is essential to the growing economy of the future as we move forward.

That party's approach to cutting back in training, colleges and universities is wrong-headed, it's the wrong direction and it's inconsistent both with Drummond and with what most proper-thinking people in Ontario feel about post-secondary education.

We'll continue to make the important investments in apprenticeships and apprenticeship training to build a better future for Ontario and all of our people.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** Well, Minister, we know you have favours to repay, but surely you understand that the governance or the proposed membership requirements of the College of Trades is not representative of the industries here in Ontario. Transferring one more penny to this group is like telling thousands of businesses and construction workers they are not wanted in this province and you intend to destroy their jobs.

By allowing this college to expand compulsory certification and without the grandfathering of tradesmen with decades of experience, that will be the death of tens of thousands of jobs right here in this province.

Minister, will you do what is right—kill the College of Trades now—or will Tim Hudak and the Ontario PCs have to do it for you and save thousands of jobs right here in the province of Ontario?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I let the question finish. I'm going to ask the member to withdraw the one part: the word that he used about the government.

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** I'm not sure what I'm withdrawing, but I'll withdraw it.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** To the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities.

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe I can just start by quoting a former colleague, a former member from Brant—a member of the party opposite—who said very articulately and accurately, Mr.

Speaker: "Instead of being critical of the process, what they"—the lobbyists—"should do" in the party opposite is "become an active part of the process and feed us as much information as they feel that they need to convince the independent panel of adjudicators that the ratios should be set in the way they feel." He has gone on, and points out that only 34 of the 150 trades have journeymen ratios, and has supported it.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have been meeting now with the College of Trades, with almost every sector, and I can't find people out in industry or in labour or in training who are not supporting it. We have 80% of our trades now that have one-to-one ratios. We have gone from 60,000 to 120,000 people in the trades—and 30,000 people every year. This is twice as good a record as the party opposite had when they were in power.

## PUBLIC TRANSIT

**Mr. Jonah Schein:** Speaker, through you to the Premier: Yesterday, the Premier complained about changes to Toronto's transit plans. He made it seem like Toronto's city council can't make up its mind on transit, but it's the McGuinty government that gutted Transit City, the original plan, by \$4 billion in 2010. He then proceeded with the mayor's plan before council even had a chance to discuss it. Will the Premier stop pointing fingers and commit to move ahead now with light rail on Eglinton and Finch and renew the Sheppard RT, regardless of the decision on Sheppard?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Transportation.

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** We kind of expected that question, Mr. Speaker, from the opposition.

Since 2003, our government has invested \$13.4 billion in public transit, more than \$6 billion enhancing GO Transit and more than \$3.8 billion in the TTC. We have a very strong transit-first Toronto Liberal caucus. They advocated for and were successful in obtaining \$8.4 billion to invest in the city of Toronto's transit.

We need a partner to implement that, and all we're saying is: Honour the memorandum of understanding, which said it was conditional on approval by city council in Toronto. We respect that cities are an order of government and we respect that they have the obligation to partner with us and to act responsibly.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Jonah Schein:** Thank you, Speaker. Back to the Premier: He says he's impatient with the city of Toronto, but Toronto transit users, we're impatient with the McGuinty government. Lack of support has contributed to fare hikes and to service cuts in the city, and the Premier's acceptance of the Ford plan without due diligence has further delayed transit expansion. Will the Premier stop pointing fingers and commit now to construct light rail on Eglinton and Finch and to renew the Scarborough RT?

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** Our government has been extremely supportive of the TTC and the city of Toronto,

and all things transit. As I've mentioned, we put \$8.4 billion on the table. We've had strong advocates in our caucus who have convinced this government to invest \$8.4 billion. We negotiated, firstly with the previous administration in the city of Toronto and subsequently with the new administration. We listened to what they wanted. We partnered with them. We simply made it conditional on approval of city council. City council has the authority to make that decision, not the mayor. So we simply asked them to get the authority of council to enable us to partner with them to spend \$8.4 billion in their city.

### ONTARIO PUBLIC SERVICE

**Mrs. Laura Albanese:** My question is to the Minister of Government Services. Many young people are coming up to the end of their final high school year and are giving serious consideration to what kind of studies they should focus on as they prepare for their careers. Many of these students are starting to research potential employment opportunities and employers before making the final decision on what field of study they should focus on.

1130

Some young people in my riding are concerned, though, about barriers they might face once they enter the workforce. Just recently, I have read that the Ontario public service has received a number of top employer standards. Could the minister explain what this means and could mean to young people in my riding and in all of Ontario who are considering a career in the Ontario public service?

**Hon. Harinder S. Takhar:** Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to take this question from my colleague for York South-Weston.

I'm also very, very pleased to inform the House that in the last three years, the Ontario public service has received numerous recognitions from outside organizations. Let me just name some of them. The OPS has become one of Canada's top 100 employers, one of Canada's best employers for new Canadians, and very recently, the OPS has been named as Canada's best diversity employer. We have got this recognition five years in a row. This award is a testament to the hard work and dedication of the people who work in the OPS, and their leadership.

I also want to say that this is also a testament to our ongoing efforts to build an inclusive, supportive and barrier-free workplace that reflects the diversity of the Ontarians we serve. I would like to encourage all the young people to consider the OPS as a viable option for their careers.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mrs. Laura Albanese:** Again, my question is to the Minister of Government Services. It is encouraging to know that these types of programs are in place, and I'm glad that the Minister of Government Services is championing diversity through his ministry and ensuring that

the hard-working employees in the OPS are representative of the people we serve. Creating a barrier-free workplace is important for anyone exploring a career in today's society.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to many groups of people in my riding who appreciate and would benefit from programs just like this in their employment sectors. I would like to ask the minister if he could share some details of the specific programs currently available to encourage an open and inclusive Ontario public service that serves all Ontarians.

**Hon. Harinder S. Takhar:** Let me just start by saying that the OPS is composed of hard-working Ontarians with unique backgrounds, experience and perspectives.

Let me just talk about three programs that we have. One is the mentorship program, which allows new employees to work with the established leadership to learn good practices in the OPS. The other is the OPS Inclusion Lens, which helps to identify potential barriers when developing policies, programs and services. We also have a program which we call "quiet places," where employees of diverse backgrounds can go to observe and practise their faith.

But at the same time, we want to make sure that people of all diversity are actually recognized in the OPS as well. Respecting each other's diversity, experience and talents allows us to achieve great things for Ontarians together.

I would like to ask all the members in the House to join me in congratulating the OPS for their tremendous contribution.

### ENERGY POLICIES

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** My question is for the Premier. The Drummond report finds cuts and savings in many areas, but it ignores the pain to families caused by your Green Energy Act.

Mr. Drummond has thrown up his hands and told Ontarians to open their wallets even wider and pay even more for energy that's already too expensive. Despite what the Auditor General told us, you're telling us it's okay to force expensive wind and solar onto the grid, creating surplus power we sell at a loss, and higher energy bills for our seniors.

Premier, how can you tell Ontario families who can barely afford their energy bills now to just sit back and take it?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Energy.

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** We are committed absolutely to clean energy, clean air and clean energy jobs. We know the health care costs from burning dirty coal. We know they invested in dirty coal when they were in government. We know they invested in more dirty air, but the huge health care costs—\$4 billion a year for the health care system and the environment—are not worth it. It's not worth it. It's not worth it.

So we've launched the Green Energy Act and we've not only been able to clean up the air, we've not only made a commitment to get out of coal; we've shown leadership for the world. The world is investing in Ontario. We got jobs for Ontarians.

And I wouldn't be surprised, Speaker, if the member opposite, before he got here, was in favour of clean energy. I wouldn't be surprised if he took some initiatives in his own jurisdiction to talk about how important clean energy was to the future of the people of his community and the province of Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Speaker, let me remind our friends that it was our party that asked for and initiated the closing of coal plants in Ontario. Now the Liberals are replacing coal with natural gas because wind turbines generate at night; they make power when we don't need it. So the bloated subsidies which clearly pay for energy we don't need are adding billions of dollars to our costs. No wonder the McGuinty Liberals have a \$30-billion deficit coming.

Premier, it's time to admit that your energy plan has failed. Will you please cancel the FIT program now, and restore clean, reliable, affordable energy for Ontario families and businesses?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Minister of Energy.

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** Thank you, Speaker. And, you know, affordability is enormously important: affordability of energy, affordability when you consider the \$4 billion a year that we were spending in health and environmental costs. When the party opposite was in power, they might have had a plan on paper, but they increased the use of coal by 127%. They were burning it, and when they ran out of coal generation they added diesel generators in communities like mine. We're all in favour of clean air, surely. We're all in favour of the thousands of jobs it brings, surely. We're all in favour of clean air. In fact, if I go to North Bay now, I wouldn't be surprised, if I go to city hall, if I saw solar panels on the roof, and I would ask, who was the mayor who put solar panels on the roof at city hall?

*Interjections.*

#### FIRE SAFETY

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for Timmins-James Bay.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order. Order. Proceed.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order. I'm standing. He's getting the question. Member?

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** My question is to the Minister of Community Safety. Minister, you will know that last year in the city of Timmins there was a disastrous fire at Rainbow Suites, one of the seniors' residences in the city of Timmins. Unfortunately, the life of Madame Levesque

was lost in that fire. Here we are about 11 months after the fact and there has yet to be an inquiry as to what we can learn from what happened in that fire so it's not repeated, not only in the city of Timmins but across this province.

My question to you is simply this: When will you call that inquiry so that we can make sure the tragedy that happened at Rainbow Suites and the passing of Madame Levesque as a result of that fire doesn't happen anywhere else in the province of Ontario?

**Hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** Thank you very much. That's a very important question and I'm sorry to see what happened, you know, with this lady, Madame Levesque, and all those who have been suffering from this incident. However, I don't call the inquiry. The fire marshal is independent. If need be, there will be an inquiry, but it's going to be called by him.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** There are no deferred votes. This House stands recessed until 3 p.m. this afternoon.

*The House recessed from 1140 to 1500.*

#### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

##### ACTON EMPLOYMENT RESOURCE CENTRE

**Mr. Ted Arnott:** A few days ago, my constituents were surprised and disappointed to learn that the employment resource centre in Acton is slated for closure. This local employment counselling service, funded by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities and delivered by Links2Care, has helped countless Acton and area residents with job searches and resumé writing. The work they do creates hope where there was once despair and turns lives around for the better when clients hear the simple words, "You got the job."

Upon hearing the news of the pending closure of the Acton Employment Resource Centre, I immediately wrote to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities to protest. Subsequently on February 9, the town of Halton Hills council passed a resolution which strongly supported the Acton jobs centre.

Let's remember that many people who are out of work in Acton don't have cars and there is no public transit in Acton. I dropped in to the Acton jobs centre unannounced on February 15, meeting some of the staff and one of the clients who spoke in glowing terms about the help she's receiving.

In today's uncertain economy, with its stubborn high unemployment rate, a jobs plan should be one of the government's highest priorities, and helping the residents of a community like Acton should be part of that jobs plan.

What will the minister do to ensure the residents of Acton continue to have access to local job counselling services?

## NORTHERN ONTARIO

**Mr. Michael Mantha:** Speaker, I had the opportunity to visit the community of Attawapiskat. There, I met wonderful children filled with hope and joy—Lisa Marie, a mother of four, Pauline, a grandmother taking care of her grandchild, and Whalen, a seven-year-old, all whom I befriended. I told them I would not forget about them, and neither should this Legislature. Some improvements are on the way, but the job is nowhere near being done.

I also want to highlight another community in need, a community that has been devastated, requesting government assistance to address several shortfalls with respect to not one but two water treatment plants within one community. Welcome to the township of the North Shore.

Our leader brought attention to this issue almost a year ago—for the last 10 years, no response, no involvement, no follow-up, no returned calls, nothing, nothing, nothing.

Complaints have been made to several ministries, and the only response received thus far is further water testing, fees and charges. By the way, the township continues to struggle with the operating costs, and community members continue to pay fees for water they cannot drink or safely bathe their children in, because for the past 10 years they've been under a boil-water advisory.

This once closely knit community has been torn apart due to the inaction of this government. Friendships have been broken and the community spirit extinguished.

The township of the North Shore and the people are desperate for help, assistance and leadership from this government. It's time for action.

## FAMILY DAY

**Mr. Monte Kwinter:** Through times of plenty and when times are tough, one thing that stays constant is Ontarians' willingness to work hard together, building a better future for ourselves and our families. But Ontarians know we can't just work for our families; it's important to take a step back from our increasingly busy lives and spend time with the ones we love.

The McGuinty government knows the importance of having a balanced work life and a balanced home life, and our government understands the value of strong families.

That's why, in 2007, we committed to introducing a new holiday in February to honour Ontario's families. On Monday, people across this province happily celebrated Ontario's fifth annual Family Day.

New Year's to Easter can be a long, cold stretch. In the dark of a frigid February, there's nothing better than the warmth of loved ones, so I was happy to see so many families in my riding of York Centre and across our province out skating together or tobogganing together or going to museums together or playing board games together. Family Day is a day to forget about the pressure of the workweek and spend some quality and relaxing time with the people who are most important in our lives.

I'm proud to be part of a government that has stayed true to its commitment to make life better for workers and families in Ontario, and I know that this holiday will continue to be celebrated by a generation of families to come.

## KRAFT HOCKEYVILLE 2012

**Mr. Steve Clark:** I'm proud to rise to help spread the word about the town of Prescott and its quest for the Kraft Hockeyville title. There's plenty to be excited about in the fort town today. The St. Lawrence Shakespeare Festival is preparing for its 10th anniversary season. There are many events planned as part of the bicentennial of the War of 1812 in and around the national historic site of Fort Wellington.

But it's the Hockeyville competition that has the people up in Prescott and the South Grenville area fired up this winter. There is a long and storied hockey tradition in Prescott, beginning with our own Hockey Hall of Famer, Leo Boivin. Known for delivering thundering bodychecks, this hard-hitting blueliner played more than 1,000 NHL games and was captain of the Boston Bruins. This year, the triple A midget tournament that proudly bears his name marks its milestone 40th anniversary. The tournament has welcomed over 5,000 players in the historic town, including future NHL all-stars like Doug Gilmore, Steve Yzerman and Eric Lindros. As they do each year, they'll drop the puck on those games in the Leo Boivin Community Centre which, like so many rinks, could use the \$100,000 in renovations that goes to the Hockeyville champ.

The momentum in Prescott is growing already. They have more than 3,000 members on the town's Hockeyville site, almost 1,300 more than any other Ontario community. Recently, they had a rally and parade, and they had over 250 people out.

I'm hoping everyone across Leeds–Grenville and, as a tribute to Leo Boivin, fans will join me in making sure Prescott is among the 15 finalists announced on Hockey Night in Canada on March 3.

## ONTARIO PLACE

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Since 1971, Ontario Place has been a family-oriented destination for the people of Ontario and especially for my riding of Trinity–Spadina. Recently, Premier McGuinty decided to shut down this facility. The government has been remarkably silent about their vision for this 96-acre park, but they seem alarmingly receptive to the replacement of water slides and rides with slot machines and roulette wheels.

I am opposed to a casino at Ontario Place. It's a bankrupt idea. The residents of my riding do not want a casino. Councillors Mike Layton and Adam Vaughan, both from my riding, have also expressed their opposition to a casino.

The Premier should know that residents in my riding, in High Park, in Toronto–Danforth, in Davenport and,

might I add, Toronto Centre will fight the proposal to build a casino in their neighbourhood. I urge the government to listen to them and back down on the proposal.

Ontario Place increased visits last year by almost 100%. Let those improvements continue, and let John Tory come back with ideas to revitalize Ontario Place. But our community is adamant: We say, "Ca-Si-No."

Ontario Place was dedicated to the people of Ontario—past, present and future. It would be a terrible mistake to replace an affordable family destination with one that caters to gamblers instead.

#### LAND DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti:** I rise today on behalf of residents of Scarborough Southwest to express our strong opposition to the proposed development of the quarry lands. The quarry lands is an area in my riding on which a private developer called the Conservatory Group has been attempting to build multiple high-rise buildings. I've spoken on this matter before and will continue to do so in this House, because what I believe is at stake is nothing less than the manner in which we build safe and healthy communities in Ontario.

The developer is seeking to build a high-rise tower complex in a community of predominantly single-family homes. Of prime concern is that this land is a contaminated brownfield area.

1510

Residents, led by the longstanding group Concerned Citizens of Quarry Lands Development, have serious and legitimate concerns over the consequences of a development of this size. The proposed development will result in a density of more than seven times greater than the surrounding community. In my view, this is not responsible development and should be reconsidered.

If the builder proceeds with the development, I'll ask that the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing both look into this matter and take immediate steps to ensure the safety of area residents and to promote the development of a healthy and visionary plan for these lands and for all the surrounding community.

#### ADAM HOLMES

**Mr. Toby Barrett:** Speaker, I recognize a true hero following the award of the Canadian Medal of Military Valour to Master Bombardier Adam Holmes of Delhi.

A member of Yankee Battery, 2nd Regiment, Royal Canadian Horse Artillery, Holmes is the son of David and Kay Holmes. He's a member of the 2 Canadian Mechanized Brigade Group at CFB Petawawa.

He was cited for actions during a four-day battle in Afghanistan during his second tour of duty in the summer of 2010.

Stationed in the Arghandab district north of Kandahar city, Holmes helped train the Afghan military while serving as a forward combat soldier fighting in near-daily

enemy contact alongside the 101st US Airborne. Holmes and his colleagues fought in areas saturated with IEDs—improvised explosive devices—and in one fierce battle he fought at close quarters with Taliban before suffering serious leg and arm injuries in a mortar attack.

Mr. Holmes ignored risk to himself repeatedly, rescuing injured allied and Afghan soldiers in the middle of these firefights.

The commander of the 2 Canadian Mechanized Brigade Group, Col. Simon Hetherington, had this to say: "We are in awe of the courage and selflessness he showed that resulted in the award of this medal. His actions were truly inspiring and serve as an excellent example for all of us in uniform."

#### ISLAMIC CIRCLE OF NORTH AMERICA

**Ms. Dipika Damerla:** I rise in the House today to talk about something really special that happened over the weekend.

As politicians, we're all used to hearing people complain about things, our constituents always telling us how things could be better. But over the weekend, something really special happened in my riding because, instead of complaining, 1,000 people came out to actually do something. We held what was called a walkathon, which was organized by the Muslim community of Mississauga and the Islamic Circle of North America, Peel chapter. They raised \$60,000 for the local hospital, which is the Credit Valley Hospital and Trillium Health Centre.

This is something fantastic because this is an example of, instead of complaining, people coming together to do something for their community. I think this is Canada at its best, especially on Family Day.

They organized it as a walkathon so that families could participate, so that grandparents, parents and children could all participate in this. It was really nice to see some strollers there as well.

I'm absolutely delighted that this took place in my riding, in Mississauga East—Cooksville, and I would like to thank the organizers.

I also want to mention that last year they raised \$50,000, this year they raised \$60,000, and I'm looking forward to them raising a lot more next year.

#### JOE BAHRO

#### ALBERT CORACE

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** It's great to be able to rise today to talk about two very important people from the village of Manotick in my great riding of Nepean—Carleton.

Manotick, Mr. Speaker, is known as the jewel of the Rideau. It has Watson's Mill and Dickinson Square, and it was home to Sir John A. Macdonald's first campaign headquarters.

It was also home to two fine men who contributed greatly to our community, and both passed away in 2011.

I would like to name Albert Corace, as well as Joe Bahro, in this House as part of Ontario's rich history. The two men, who passed last year, had great stories.

Joe Bahro was a member of the Legion and he was also a Lion. He spent a lot of time fundraising for our community. He was also known on occasion to take me in parades in his beautiful yellow Parisienne. He leaves behind his wife, Jean Bahro. A great lady, Jean. She is at home today, I think, watching this.

Albert was also a great guy. He came from the great United States, and he fit right in to our community with that great big booming Yankee voice of his. He was the president of our Kiwanis Club in Manotick when he passed away. He was also a member of the Knights of Columbus. He too was known from time to time to drive me in a parade on a hot summer Ottawa day.

He leaves behind his lovely wife, Claudette, who decided very early after her husband passed away that she would resume his duties as president of our local Kiwanis Club.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak on behalf of every member of this assembly to say that the best part of our job is meeting with the people in our communities. And I can also say with a heavy heart that the worst part of our job is when we lose those wonderful people who make up more than the bricks and mortar of our communities ever could.

I say to the Corace and Bahro families, my sincere condolences.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I beg to inform the House of the following exchange in order of precedence for private members' public business: Ms. Thompson assumes ballot item number 17, and Ms. Munro assumes ballot item number 69.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Am I still 75? Did I win the lottery again?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I hope you're not assuming that there is a conspiracy here, Gilles.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** There is.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### SECURITY FOR COURTS, ELECTRICITY GENERATING FACILITIES AND NUCLEAR FACILITIES ACT, 2012 LOI DE 2012 SUR LA SÉCURITÉ DES TRIBUNAUX, DES CENTRALES ÉLECTRIQUES ET DES INSTALLATIONS NUCLÉAIRES

Mrs. Meilleur moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 34, An Act to repeal the Public Works Protection Act, amend the Police Services Act with respect to court

security and enact the Security for Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012 / *Projet de loi 34, Loi abrogeant la Loi sur la protection des ouvrages publics, modifiant la Loi sur les services policiers en ce qui concerne la sécurité des tribunaux et édictant la Loi de 2012 sur la sécurité des centrales électriques et des installations nucléaires.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for a short statement.

**Hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** I will make my statement during ministerial statements.

#### MAJOR-GENERAL SIR ISAAC BROCK DAY ACT, 2012

##### LOI DE 2012 SUR LE JOUR DU MAJOR-GÉNÉRAL SIR ISAAC BROCK

Mr. Clark moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 35, An Act to proclaim October 13 in each year as Major-General Sir Isaac Brock Day in Ontario / *Projet de loi 35, Loi visant à proclamer le 13 octobre de chaque année Jour du major-général Sir Isaac Brock en Ontario.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for a short statement.

**Mr. Steve Clark:** The title of the bill explains it all. I also would like to thank again the member for Niagara Falls and the member for Welland for co-sponsoring the bill and also for some very favourable comments I received from the Minister of the Environment.

#### STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

##### BLACK HISTORY MONTH

**Hon. Margaret R. Best:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the Ontario Legislature for Black History Month. I join Canadians from coast to coast to celebrate the history, achievement and contributions of black Canadians.

1520

The story of black people in Canada is a narrative that began before the founding of the nation and is one that continues to be written with every passing day. The pulse of that story beats with rhythm and energy and is a part of the lifeblood of our country. That is why it is so fitting to set aside a period of time each year to revisit old chapters and to look towards new ones.

It was one Dr. Carter G. Woodson, the father of black history, who saw the importance of setting aside time to recognize the achievements of a people who were being

written out of history, whose stories were hidden from the textbooks and the library books, from the newspapers and media reports, and whose accomplishments and successes did not emerge to the forefront. It was that legacy that brought about Dr. Woodson's vision of blacks as keepers of their own history so it would not be lost and it would not be forgotten.

Today, Mr. Speaker, as Ontarians, we are all entrusted with being the custodians, protectors and promoters of each other's most important truths and identities. The history of black people in this land is a vital and exciting part of that collective trust.

We recognize the Ontario Black History Society, the archives of some of our history, and its president, Mrs. Rosemary Sadlier. However, we all have a shared responsibility in ensuring that the history of black Canadians is archived in every institution of learning, through libraries, newspapers, books and other mediums of record in the province of Ontario and in Canada.

Our history exists in the corridors of the Parliament of Canada, where Honourable Dr. Jean Augustine was the first black woman elected. In 1995, Dr. Augustine moved a motion supported by the Ontario Black History Society declaring February as Black History Month in Canada.

Others, such as Senator Don Meredith and those from across Canada—the Right Honourable Michaëlle Jean, former Governor General of Canada; Senators Donald Oliver and Anne Cools; and Honourable Marlene Jennings—have authored important chapters through the noble path of public service.

In the corridors of the Ontario Legislature: Honourable Lincoln Alexander, the first black Lieutenant Governor of Ontario; Mr. Leonard Braithwaite, the first black member elected; Mrs. Zanana Akande, the first black woman elected; and Dr. Alvin Curling and Mrs. Mary Anne Chambers were black members elected. Dr. Curling was the first black Canadian to hold a cabinet position in Ontario and the first black Speaker of the Ontario Legislature.

At Toronto city hall, William Peyton Hubbard was the first black Canadian to hold public office in a Canadian city, elected to city council in 1894. In our educational institutions, Dr. Avis Glaze blazed the trail, along with other black educators. In our hospitals, Dr. John Douglas Salmon was the first black chief of surgery in a Canadian hospital. In our courthouses, the appointment of Honourable Justice Aston Joseph Hall to the provincial court bench this year is notable. He sits as a role model for black youth throughout the province.

Ontario is home to individuals like Josiah Henson, who was the first black person featured on a Canadian stamp. He helped to establish the Dawn Settlement in Dresden, Ontario, as a refuge for former slaves after escaping through the Underground Railroad to Canada. The Dudley Laws of this world fought for equality and justice with shared determination and much personal sacrifice.

I certainly feel humbled to benefit from the sacrifices, vision and leadership of those individuals and other

trailblazers, as I too participate in the history of blacks in Ontario and in Canada. Last year, I became the first black woman re-elected as MPP in this Legislature.

**Interjection:** Hear, hear.

*Applause.*

**Hon. Margaret R. Best:** Thank you.

Also, today, I sit with my colleague MPP Michael Coteau. He and I have also crossed another threshold together. This is the first time two black elected members are seated on the government side of this Ontario Legislature.

*Applause.*

**Hon. Margaret R. Best:** As we celebrate Black History Month, these words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., whose memorial now stands tall in Washington, DC, are thought-provoking: "True peace is not merely the absence of tension; it is the presence of justice." We all have a part to play in ensuring that not just black people but all people have the security of a just society.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I think it is apropos to read the closing lines from Maya Angelou's poem *Still I Rise*, which words are metaphoric to the resiliency of black people and our history:

Out of the huts of history's shame  
I rise  
Up from a past that's rooted in pain  
I rise  
I'm a black ocean, leaping and wide,  
Welling and swelling I bear in the tide.  
Leaving behind nights of terror and fear  
I rise  
Into a daybreak that's wondrously clear  
I rise  
Bringing the gifts that my ancestors gave,  
I am the dream and the hope of the slave.  
I rise  
I rise  
I rise.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would ask all of you to join us today for a reception with the Premier to honour black history, with my co-host, Mr. Michael Coteau, MPP, at 6 p.m., right here in the Ontario Legislature in the government caucus room.

## SÉCURITÉ COMMUNAUTAIRE COMMUNITY SAFETY

**L'hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** Monsieur le Président, je prends la parole aujourd'hui devant l'Assemblée législative pour présenter la Loi de 2012 sur la sécurité des tribunaux, des centrales électriques et des installations nucléaires, qui, si elle est adoptée, abrogera et remplacera la Loi sur la protection des ouvrages publics.

La nouvelle loi nous aidera à établir un juste équilibre entre la sécurité et les droits civils lorsque nous devons assurer la protection des palais de justice, des centrales électriques et des installations nucléaires de l'Ontario.

The Public Works Protection Act previously allowed the province to designate any installation as a public work. Concerns were raised about whether the PWPA, which became law in 1939, is too broad and outdated. That legislation was passed at the outset of World War II, in an atmosphere of fear of sabotage of the province's power plants, dams, bridges and other critical public infrastructure.

In response, the government asked the Honourable Roy McMurtry, a former Ontario Chief Justice, to review the legislation. In his report, Mr. McMurtry recommended its repeal and replacement. Mr. Speaker, we are moving ahead on the recommendations of Mr. Justice McMurtry.

La nouvelle loi que nous présentons aujourd'hui, la Loi sur la sécurité des tribunaux, des centrales électriques et des installations nucléaires, est plus moderne, transparente et axée sur les mesures de sécurité nécessaires dans les palais de justice, les installations nucléaires et les grandes centrales électriques.

Although the powers of the PWPA have not been used extensively, the time has come to modernize how Ontario protects some of its key infrastructure.

The PWPA is, however, relied on in limited circumstances. It is used on a daily basis to provide security for courts, nuclear facilities and certain electricity generating plants. In December 2010, the Ombudsman produced a report that raised important questions about how the PWPA works and how it was used at the time of the G20 summit in Toronto earlier that year.

1530

The McMurtry report recommended that the PWPA be repealed and that Ontario consider potential policy and security gaps as a result of its repeal. In response to Mr. McMurtry's report, the government conducted extensive consultations to determine what measures would be needed to ensure security, should the PWPA be repealed.

These consultations sought input and advice from representatives of nuclear operators and regulators, electricity producers, justice partners and municipalities. We also consulted with civil liberty advocates to be sure that the appropriate balance was struck between security and civil liberty.

The bill we are introducing today has broad consensus among all of those stakeholders. I would like to thank both the Ombudsman and Mr. McMurtry for their work on this important issue.

The proposed legislation would do the following three things: repeal the Public Works Protection Act, set out a legislative amendment to the Police Services Act to address court security, and set out stand-alone legislation respecting security at prescribed electricity generating and nuclear facilities.

La loi proposée est conforme aux pouvoirs conférés actuellement aux gardiens de sécurité des tribunaux en vertu de la Loi sur la protection des ouvrages publics. La loi octroie au personnel de sécurité les pouvoirs suivants, si l'exercice de ces pouvoirs est raisonnable afin de s'acquitter de ses responsabilités :

—exiger qu'une personne qui pénètre dans un palais de justice ou qui s'y trouve présente une pièce d'identité et fournisse des renseignements afin d'évaluer si elle représente un risque pour la sécurité;

—procéder à la fouille, sans mandat, d'une personne qui pénètre ou tente de pénétrer dans les lieux où se déroulent des instances judiciaires ou qui s'y trouve, ainsi qu'à la fouille de son véhicule et des autres biens dont elle a la garde ou le soin;

—procéder, sans mandat, en employant au besoin la force raisonnable, à la fouille d'une personne sous garde qui se trouve sur les lieux où se déroulent des instances judiciaires, ou qui est transportée à destination ou en provenance de ces lieux et à la fouille des biens dont elle a la garde ou le soin.

I would like to emphasize that the legislation does not compel a person entering or attempting to enter a courthouse to submit to a search, produce identification or provide information. A member of the public can simply walk away. However, if they persist in entering the courthouse after refusing to provide information or submit to a search, court security personnel can refuse entry and/or demand that the person leave the premises, and use reasonable force if necessary to exclude or remove the person. If a person continues to try to enter and/or refuses to leave, they could be arrested.

In terms of other facilities, we've narrowed the list of public works to electricity generating and nuclear facilities. The legislation will apply to "prescribed electricity generating facilities" and "prescribed nuclear facilities."

Unlike the PWPA, this act covers very limited categories of infrastructure. Prescribing any additional categories of infrastructure would require amendments to the act, as opposed to regulation. The process for changing an act is very transparent and open, and the content of any proposed amendments would be subject to public debate.

The act designates security personnel at these facilities as peace officers, with the power to request any person who wishes to enter or is on the premises to produce identification and provide information for the purposes of assessing the person's security risk; and search, upon consent, any person, property or vehicle entering or on the premises.

Comme les dispositions applicables à la sécurité des tribunaux, la loi n'oblige pas une personne à se soumettre à la fouille, à produire une pièce d'identité ou à fournir des renseignements. Elle peut décider de s'en aller.

Toutefois, si la personne insiste pour pénétrer dans les lieux après avoir refusé de fournir des renseignements ou de subir une fouille, le personnel de sécurité peut refuser de lui permettre de pénétrer dans les lieux ou lui ordonner de quitter, ou employer au besoin la force raisonnable pour l'empêcher d'y pénétrer ou la faire sortir. Si la personne continue d'essayer de pénétrer dans les lieux ou de refuser de quitter les lieux, elle peut être arrêtée.

There is one important aspect of the PWPA that we have not replicated. The PWPA gives guards the

authority to exercise their powers in the “approaches” to a public work. The “approach” to a facility was a concern for Justice McMurtry and civil liberties groups because it is vague and hard to define. Under our proposal, guards could exercise the specified powers only on the premises; these powers would not apply off the premises. Since the “approach” falls outside of the premises of the nuclear facility, any security issues should be addressed in partnership with the local police of that jurisdiction.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that Ontario has long been a province in which human rights and civil liberties have been valued and celebrated. Our government recognizes that we have a responsibility to ensure that our courts and critical infrastructure are protected; however, we must always balance the need for security with a respect for civil liberties like the freedom of assembly and the principles of an open and transparent justice system. I believe that this legislation does indeed strike that necessary balance.

Notre gouvernement est bien conscient de sa responsabilité d'assurer la protection des tribunaux et de l'infrastructure essentielle. Toutefois, nous devons toujours veiller à établir un équilibre entre le besoin de sécurité et le respect des libertés civiles comme la liberté d'association et le principe d'un système judiciaire ouvert et transparent. Je crois que cette loi atteint justement le bon équilibre.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues in this House to support this legislation.

**Le Président (L'hon. Dave Levac):** Merci beaucoup, madame la Ministre.

Responses to the ministers' statements.

## BLACK HISTORY MONTH

**Mr. Ted Arnott:** I am honoured to have the opportunity to say a few words in recognition of Black History Month, and I want to thank the member for Whitby–Oshawa for sharing some of her time with me.

As many members of this House will recall, in 2008 I initiated and introduced a bill recognizing August 1 as Emancipation Day in Ontario, commemorating the day in 1834 when slavery was abolished in the British Empire, including, of course, Canada. That bill also had the distinction of being the first bill ever introduced in the Ontario Legislature to be jointly co-sponsored by members of different parties.

Three and a half years ago, I had attended a particularly meaningful and moving ceremony in the community of Glen Allan in Mapleton township in Wellington county. On that day, I joined former Lieutenant Governor Lincoln Alexander to help unveil an Ontario Heritage Trust plaque to commemorate the Queen's Bush settlement. The best way to tell the story is to share the eloquent words that are written on the plaque:

“In the early 19th century, the vast unsettled area between Waterloo county and Lake Huron was known as the ‘Queen's Bush.’ More than 1,500 free and formerly enslaved blacks pioneered scattered farms throughout the Queen's Bush, starting in about 1820. Many settled along

the Peel and Wellesley township border with Glen Allan, Hawkesville and Wallenstein as important centres. Working together, these industrious and self-reliant settlers built churches, schools, and a strong and vibrant community life. American missionaries taught local black children at the Mount Hope and Mount Pleasant schools....”

Just as I was leaving the ceremony that day, a man who I didn't even know approached me to say that August 1 should be recognized as Emancipation Day in Ontario and that a bill should be introduced to make it so. While driving home, I couldn't stop thinking about what he had said. I decided to look into it further and asked legislative counsel to draft the legislation that was eventually passed into law with support from all three parties.

During this month, I would hope that all Ontarians will take a moment to learn about some of the many contributions that the black community has made to our province. They have played an integral role in so many ways in shaping Ontario into the province we know today, and have every good reason to be proud.

1540

## COMMUNITY SAFETY

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I would like to respond to the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services on her bill to repeal the Public Works Protection Act and replace it with other legislation.

Her statement was a bit of a benign assessment of what actually was the genesis of this piece of legislation. The government had little or no choice, based on the fumbling and bumbling and the absolute mess that they made of policing the G20 here in 2010. Let's not forget that that was what caused them to have to bring in this piece of legislation.

You will recall that, at that time—and this was part of the Ombudsman's report. It was not an observation; it was a scathing indictment of the handling of the McGuinty government, and laid blame squarely at their feet for the mess of the G20. Let's not mince words here, Mr. Speaker. It was a disastrous operation on the part of the McGuinty government.

He made it clear that it was so wrapped in secrecy—in fact, this Legislature was still sitting, yet the government passed a regulation behind closed doors, giving the police the authority to use the previous act in order to police the G20. And this misinformation and also the way it was portrayed—in fact, the government went out of its way to ensure that the people had the understanding that the police had these massive new powers with which to police the G20. Therefore, as a result of that, hundreds of people were improperly detained and arrested.

So at this point we welcome the introduction of the legislation. We're certainly going to take a good look at it. I haven't had a chance to review the entire part; I did have a briefing on behalf of the minister today, and I appreciate that. But we will take a good look, and we'll

also make sure that stakeholders have an opportunity to comment on it.

But let's not forget why we're here today with the introduction of this piece of legislation. It was the abdication of the responsibility of this government in 2010. And let's remember that later that year—while the Premier would never do the right thing and actually fire a minister—by cover of darkness and recess, there was a cabinet shuffle that summer. The former minister responsible for passing that regulation was out and a new minister was put in place.

### BLACK HISTORY MONTH

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** It is with pride that New Democrats celebrate Black History Month in the province of Ontario.

It's important to pause and recognize the contributions, efforts and milestones made over 400 years of African-Canadian history, even before Confederation. It is also a time for each of us to reflect on the struggles that have also occurred over this period and to commit ourselves to creating better, greater and more equitable opportunities for every Ontarian.

I would like to tell you about a special connection between the riding of Trinity-Spadina and the efforts we celebrate today. Eight years before slavery was abolished in the British Empire, 12 slaves chose freedom over slavery and began their escape from the southern United States. Fearing recapture and return to slavery, they travelled at night and rested during the day, making their journey northward towards Upper Canada. In Toronto, they were denied membership in every church they approached.

These 12 fugitive slaves could have given up. Instead, they banded together and formed their own congregation under the leadership of Elder Washington Christian. Slowly, the congregation built a home for itself, moving from members' homes to schoolhouses and finally to a church building of its own. Almost 200 years later, the First Baptist Church at Huron and D'Arcy streets is an example of what can be accomplished when individuals strive toward a common purpose.

Today, we should all be working together to ensure equal opportunities for the descendants of that original congregation. We should strive for equal opportunity for every member of the African-Canadian diaspora and commit to exposing and abolishing racism and injustice wherever it exists.

We can see the results of racism and injustice around us: racialized poverty, incarceration, profiling. These feed upon each other to reduce the freedom and opportunities available to many members of our community.

With dedication, commitment and effort, we can reach true freedom, equality and opportunity.

### COMMUNITY SAFETY

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** The repeal and replacement of the Public Works Protection Act is a direct result of the

failed and misleading way that the McGuinty government handled security during the G20 summit. More than 1,100 people were—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I would like the member to withdraw that statement.

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Withdrawn.

Andrea Horwath introduced a bill that would have established an independent commission to perform a full public inquiry into the decisions and actions of the government and the police during the G20 summit. I think there are a lot of questions that still remain. The potential for abuse in the Public Works Protection Act was beyond troubling.

What made it worse was the fact that the McGuinty government—my apologies—passed secret regulations that severely curtailed civil liberties. It led to inconsistent and arbitrary enforcements of the act. How do you expect citizens to obey a regulation that they do not know was passed?

I look forward to seeing and examining amendments to an outdated law that are now being put before us. I would like to see that the broad definition of infrastructure is taken out completely. The powers under such legislation should not pre-emptively include all buildings; instead it should only protect the necessary structures, such as courthouses and nuclear and electrical facilities.

I mostly look forward to seeing the ability of the government to pass secret regulations eliminated. Changes should be required to be introduced through legislation that has to be discussed, and that will make people aware of their rights and obligations.

We need accountability mechanisms to provide for cases where citizens think their liberties have been violated. We need people to be told what their rights are and given a choice. I sure hope that these amendments will address the plethora of issues that the government's mishandling of the G20 security became the symbol of.

The amendments will not do much to change the injustices that were committed during the G20 summit on unsuspecting protestors, for which the government has not apologized. Hopefully it will prevent the trampling of civil liberties that happened during the G20 summit from happening ever again.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I stand before you somewhat penitent. I made a mistake earlier; I missed motions before I went to ministers' statements. So, are there motions?

There being none, it is now time for petitions.

### PETITIONS

#### ANIMAL PROTECTION

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** I have a petition calling on the province of Ontario to remove the snapping turtle from the Ontario Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act hunted species list. I want to thank Robert Bowles, the founder

of an organization called Kids for Turtles in Orillia, for presenting this to me with 11,000 names.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas under the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act the snapping turtle can be taken with a valid sport or fishing licence by box or funnel trap or by bare hands. Daily limit is two, possession limit is five;

"Whereas the governments of Ontario and Canada and endangered species review boards agree that, due to development of their natural habitat, low reproduction rate, vehicular traffic, human persecution and legal hunting, snapping turtles are at risk of disappearing from Ontario, and therefore have listed snapping turtles as a species of special concern;

"Whereas seven of eight of Ontario's native turtle species are listed provincially and nationally as species at risk;

"Whereas hunting of seven of these species has been completely banned in Ontario, including the not-at-risk painted turtle. Astonishingly, it is still legal to hunt the snapping turtle, one of the at-risk turtle species;

"Whereas the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources has no data to back up its claims that a hunt of small numbers is sustainable and that snapping turtles are widespread and locally abundant (a contradiction to the findings of the Ontario and national species at risk review boards);

"Whereas no Ontario region or hunting zone population figures exist;

"Whereas no special licence exists that would enable the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources to record the number of snapping turtles taken each hunting season in each region/zone;

"Whereas after three years of public outcry and political discussion the snapping turtle remains a hunted species in Ontario;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the snapping turtle, an Ontario and national listed species at risk, be removed from the Ontario Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act hunted species list."

I'm pleased to present that to Jason for Jason to present it to the table.

1550

## WIND TURBINES

**Mr. Todd Smith:** I have quite a stack of petitions here from Algoma-Manitoulin that I'd like to read in.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas there is a growing body of evidence confirming industrial wind development has serious adverse effects on host communities;

"Whereas over 135 people in Ontario have reported serious negative health effects from industrial wind development, and at least a dozen families have been bought out of their homes;

"Whereas Ontario's Green Energy Act has ended local planning control by stripping municipal councils of their rights;

"Whereas 80 municipal councils, representing two million Ontarians, called on the government to put in place a full moratorium on industrial wind development until an independent epidemiological health study is completed, proper environmental regulations and protections are put in place, and local democracy is restored;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Immediately put a moratorium on all industrial wind proposals; fund an independent epidemiological health study to develop safe setbacks; legislate those findings; develop stringent environmental protection standards for natural areas; and require all projects to comply with regulations based on science and local planning."

I agree with this petition from Algoma-Manitoulin and will be signing it and sending it to the table with Kriti.

## DIAGNOSTIC SERVICES

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** I have this petition from the people of Sudbury and Nickel Belt.

"Whereas the Ontario government made PET scanning ... a publicly insured health service" available to cancer and cardiac patients; and

"Whereas," since October 2009, "insured PET scans" are performed "in Ottawa, London, Toronto, Hamilton and Thunder Bay; and

"Whereas the city of Greater Sudbury is a hub for health care in northeastern Ontario, with Health Sciences North, the regional cancer program and the Northern Ontario School of Medicine;

"We ... petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make PET scans available through Health Sciences North, thereby serving and providing equitable access to the citizens of northeastern Ontario."

I fully support this petition, will affix my name to it and ask page James to bring it to the Clerk.

## CLIMATE CHANGE

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** I have a petition here from Zero Carbon Ontario.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas global climate change is the most serious threat facing humanity and poses significant risks to our environment, economy, society and human health; and

"More than 97% of scientists working in the disciplines contributing to studies of our climate and all national science academies accept that climate change is almost certainly being caused by human activities mainly due to the use of fossil fuels; and

"The objective of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is 'stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system'; and

"Climate scientists are now warning us that limiting global temperature increase to 1.5 degrees centigrade is essential; and

"Ontario has a clear responsibility to reduce our emissions given that our per capita greenhouse gas emissions are among the highest in the world; and

"With the introduction of the Green Energy Act and feed-in tariff program, Ontario is an example to the rest of the world of the principle of renewable energy development; and

"The best research today indicates that energy demands are decreasing and that sufficient potential energy from a diverse supply of renewable sources exists to meet Ontario's current and projected energy demands;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Immediately prepare a plan that requires that 100% of Ontario's stationary energy be from zero-carbon sources before the end of 2023, with a timeline to be audited annually by the Auditor General and published reports."

I send this petition up with Katelyn.

#### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I have a petition, signed by a great many of the good citizens of Oxford county, that was presented to me by Lisa Donaldson from Tavistock, and it reads as follows:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Tavistock's Bonnie Brae Health Care Centre is an 80-bed, D-class nursing home that must be either rebuilt or closed by July 2014; and

"Whereas there is currently an application by a private operator to move the 80 licensed beds outside of Oxford county to the city of London, despite the recent opening of two other long-term-care homes in Middlesex county in 2010; and

"Whereas long-term-care wait times in Oxford county can be as much as 134 days longer than in Middlesex county; and

"Whereas Tavistock receives referrals from the nearby Waterloo Wellington CCAC, which has among the highest waits for long-term care in the province;

"We, the undersigned, request that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario retain these beds in Tavistock and seek partners to fast-track replacement of the Bonnie Brae as part of Ontario's 10-year plan to modernize 35,000 long-term-care beds."

I affix my signature, Mr. Speaker, as I agree with this petition.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

**Mr. John O'Toole:** It's my pleasure to present a petition on behalf of my constituents in the riding of Durham. It reads as follows:

"Whereas citizens are concerned that contaminants in materials used as fill for pits and quarries may endanger water quality and the natural environment of the greenbelt; and

"Whereas the Ministry of the Environment has a responsibility and" indeed "a duty to protect the sensitive areas of the greenbelt and provincially sensitive wetlands; and

"Whereas the government of Ontario has the lead responsibility to provide the tools" necessary "to lower-tier governments to plan, protect and enforce clear, effective policies governing the application and permitting process for the placement of fill in abandoned pits and quarries" and other locations; and

"Whereas this process requires clarification regarding rules respecting what materials may be used to rehabilitate or fill abandoned pits and quarries;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, ask the Minister of the Environment to initiate a moratorium on the clean fill application and permit process on the greenbelt until there are clear rules; and we further ask that the" government of Ontario "take all necessary actions to protect our" wetland and "water and prevent contamination of the greenbelt, specifically at 4148 Regional Highway 2, Newcastle, and Lakeridge Road in Durham," as was mentioned yesterday in the media coverage.

I'm pleased to present this and support it. I present it to Ruby to bring to the table, and I'll sign it as well.

#### LYME DISEASE

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the tick-borne illness known as chronic Lyme disease, which mimics many catastrophic illnesses such as multiple sclerosis, Crohn's, Alzheimer's, arthritic diabetes, depression, chronic fatigue and fibromyalgia, is increasingly endemic in Canada, but scientifically validated diagnostic tests and treatment choices are currently not available in Ontario, forcing patients to seek these in the USA and Europe; and

"Whereas the Canadian Medical Association informed the public, governments and the medical profession in the May 30, 2000, edition of their professional journal that Lyme disease is endemic throughout Canada, particularly in southern Ontario; and

"Whereas the Ontario public health system and the Ontario health insurance plan currently do not fund those specific tests that accurately serve the process of establishing a clinical diagnosis, but only recognize testing procedures known in the medical literature to provide false negatives at 45% to 95% of the time;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to request the Minister of Health to direct that the Ontario public health system and OHIP include all currently available and scientifically verified tests for acute and chronic Lyme diagnosis, to do everything necessary to" raise "public awareness of Lyme disease in Ontario, and to have internationally developed diagnostic and successful treatment protocols available to patients and physicians."

I hereby sign my signature.

## KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I have a petition today from a wonderful individual, Diane Guyette, who lives in Keene, Ontario—Keene? The member from Durham, I think, has roots in Keene, so he may know the Guyette family.

A petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, Canada, draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to the following:

"Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada;

"Whereas real progress has been made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease, in particular the development of a bioartificial kidney;

"We, the undersigned, call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make research funding available for the explicit purpose of conducting bioartificial kidney research as an extension to the research being successfully conducted at several centres in the United States."

I agree with this and will affix my signature to it.

## HYDRO DAM

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I have a petition I want to share with you from one of my constituents, who also has a residence in the Muskoka Lakes area. It is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

1600

"Whereas the McGuinty government permitted the release of crown lands to enable the development of a hydro dam in the heart of Bala without discussion or proper consultation with the municipality of the township of Muskoka Lakes, the district of Muskoka or the residents and businesses who would be directly affected; and

"Whereas the community is a tourism destination which is dependent on Bala Falls as an attraction; and

"Whereas residents and business people alike are deeply concerned about the economic and environmental impact that the construction and operation of the dam will have on the community;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the McGuinty government and in particular the Minister of Natural Resources reverse the decision to release crown lands for a hydro dam in Bala Falls."

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to present this petition on my constituent's behalf.

## WIND TURBINES

**Mr. Todd Smith:** This petition comes from Prince Edward county.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the proposed Gilead Power project in Prince Edward county is currently planned for an area that the municipality has designated for another purpose; and

"Whereas it's the opinion of real estate experts in Prince Edward county that the installation of the Gilead industrial wind factory will negatively impact property

values and the tourism sector, which is vital to the economic success of Prince Edward county; and

"Whereas other jurisdictions have recognized that it is environmentally counterproductive to put industrial wind factories in important bird areas, such as the one that exists on the south shore of Prince Edward county; and

"Whereas that recognition was also accepted by the Senate of Canada through a unanimous resolution;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the public consultation period for the EBR project number 011-5239, also known as the Gilead project, be extended to April 1 to allow the community sufficient time to make clear their arguments as to the negative impact that the project will have on the people, economy and ecology of Prince Edward county."

I agree with this petition and will be signing it.

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

**Mr. John O'Toole:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's nice to get two in in one day. It reads as follows:

"Whereas citizens are concerned that contaminants in materials used as fill for pits and quarries may endanger water quality and the natural environment of the greenbelt; and

"Whereas the Ministry of the Environment has a responsibility and a duty to protect the sensitive areas of the greenbelt and provincially sensitive wetlands; and

"Whereas the government of Ontario has the lead responsibility to provide the tools to lower-tier governments to plan, protect and enforce clear, effective policies governing the application and permitting process for the placement of fill in abandoned pits and quarries; and

"Whereas this process requires clarification regarding rules respecting what materials may be used to rehabilitate or fill abandoned pits and quarries;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, ask the Minister of the Environment to initiate a moratorium on the clean fill application and permit process on the greenbelt until there are clear rules; and we further ask that the provincial government take all necessary actions to protect our water and prevent contamination of the greenbelt, specifically at 4148 Regional Highway 2, Newcastle, and Lakeridge Road in Durham."

I'm pleased to sign and support this and present it to the table.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

HEALTHY HOMES RENOVATION  
TAX CREDIT ACT, 2012LOI DE 2012 SUR LE CRÉDIT D'IMPÔT  
POUR L'AMÉNAGEMENT DU LOGEMENT  
AXÉ SUR LE BIEN-ÊTRE

Resuming the debated adjourned on February 21, 2012, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 2, An Act to amend the Taxation Act, 2007 to implement a healthy homes renovation tax credit / Projet de loi 2, Loi modifiant la Loi de 2007 sur les impôts en vue de mettre en oeuvre le crédit d'impôt pour l'aménagement du logement axé sur le bien-être.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate?

**Mr. Randy Pettapiece:** I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak to Bill 2, the healthy homes renovation tax credit.

This Liberal bill will do little to help seniors in my riding of Perth–Wellington. Most seniors cannot afford to spend \$10,000 in order to receive a \$1,500 tax credit.

Because of the Liberals' tax-and-spend ways our province is in an economic crisis.

Seniors do not have the means to afford costly renovations when they are coping with rising costs for the heating of their home and when they are saddled with the HST on those home-heating costs.

Here's a far better plan: giving seniors, and indeed all Ontarians, 8% of the cost of home heating to put back in their pockets.

As my colleague Peter Shurman, the PC caucus critic for finance, has stated, the percentage of seniors who will benefit from this tax credit is incredibly small, Mr. Speaker. This bill would help only a very tiny group. It benefits those who can already afford renovations and it does nothing to help those seniors who cannot afford to renovate their homes.

I know first-hand why seniors want to renovate their homes. My wife, Jane, and I are small business owners with our own painting company.

Mr. Speaker, the McGuinty government could do so much more by helping all families in this province: They could help business to create jobs; they could cut red tape that causes our province to lose jobs; they could reduce the size and cost of government; and they could ensure accountability and value for money for taxpayers.

As I stated, Mr. Speaker, Bill 2 only benefits a small number of seniors, and it does little to improve accessibility for seniors. Seniors, be they in communities such as Mitchell, St. Marys, Stratford, Arthur, Drayton, Palmerston or the many other communities in my riding, are not in a position to spend \$10,000 so that they can get \$1,500 back. Did you know, Mr. Speaker, that the proposed healthy homes renovation tax would cost the provincial treasury \$60 million in 2011-12?

Tim Hudak and the Ontario PC caucus have been telling the Liberal government for eight and a half years that their reckless, out-of-control spending cannot continue. Mr. Drummond confirmed this when he issued his report last week. He brought forward 362 recommendations to help our province recover from Liberal mismanagement, and 105 of them are in the health care section alone.

Mr. Speaker, Ontario is standing at the brink of an economic disaster. The job of government is to create the right economic conditions so that businesses thrive and, in turn, create good-paying jobs. We need to do more

than to give a tax credit to a small number of seniors when Ontario has lost thousands and thousands of full-time private sector jobs. Our Ontario PC caucus has stepped up to the plate with a job creation task force whose mandate is to bring forward new jobs, ideas and job creation.

Our province was once the economic engine that drove Canada; now we are at the back of the pack. We have a deficit of \$16 billion—\$16 billion. We're borrowing about \$1.8 million every hour, every day. With each passing hour, we're digging the hole deeper. Ontario's jobless rate is higher than the national average; in fact, our jobless rate has been higher than the rest of Canada for many, many months. This means that in far too many cases, people who are supporting their aging parents or supplementing their parents' or grandparents' retirement incomes may well be out of a job. At a time like this, a responsible government would be considering measures that would target our job crisis. They would be proposing bills for consideration in this House that are innovative and carefully thought out, bills based on sound economics, not on questionable politics.

Just how much of an impact would Bill 2 have on Ontario families and seniors? I am told, Mr. Speaker, that about 13% of Ontario's population—that is, 1.8 million people—are over the age of 65 and meet the age requirements of Bill 2. The median income for seniors in Ontario, meaning that the largest number of seniors fall into this income category, is \$25,000 a year for a single person or \$45,000 for a couple. To be eligible for the \$1,500 maximum-end tax credit under Bill 2, a senior has to spend \$10,000 on home renovations. Quite simply, the math does not add up. Seniors cannot afford it.

Today, our seniors have much lower returns from their investments than they have had in the past. Interest rates have fallen. The nest egg that provides the senior's cash flow is dwindling. Plain and simple, many seniors cannot afford costly home renovations. And they're concerned not only for their future but also for their children's future and their grandchildren's future. They know that, thanks to the McGuinty government, it will be a future of debt stretching as far as the eye can see.

The Liberals have the option to help more Ontario seniors by bringing in a real economic action plan, including debt relief and broad-based tax relief. I urge them to do that, and I urge them to do that soon. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**1610**

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I'd like to comment on some of the comments from my colleague from Perth–Wellington. We agree with a lot of his comments. Many seniors can't afford to renovate their houses, and the percentage of seniors that can afford to do it is very small. But one thing where we disagree a little bit—we all know this—the longer we keep seniors in their homes, it's actually better for them, but it's also cheaper for the economy. So if this bill does proceed to committee, it's our hope that

we can do as much as we can to make sure that as many seniors as possible can qualify for this.

One thing I'd like to bring up again is a topic that was brought by my honourable colleague Gilles Bisson—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. John Vanthof:** The member from Timmins—James Bay; pardon me. He brought up a case about a lady who couldn't go down the stairs, because of arthritis, to get to her washer and dryer. If there was money to bring the washer and dryer upstairs, that would keep her in her home longer. It's a good idea.

I think there are lots of ideas like that, and we should take a broader approach and see what we can do to actually keep seniors in their homes. We are afraid that such a narrow approach is going to be taken that things that should qualify, won't. We're hoping that if this bill makes it to committee, that we sit down and make it as broad as possible so it's actually going to do what it was intended to do.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Let me say that I was listening intently to the new member from Perth—Wellington, and he highlighted a number of things that I think are important with discussion of Bill 2, An Act to amend the Taxation Act, 2007 to implement a healthy homes renovation tax credit, from our colleague the Minister of Finance, Mr. Duncan—interesting, Speaker.

Certainly, during the recess, when we left here in early December until coming back just yesterday, I had the opportunity to visit with many seniors in Peterborough riding, and many of them were talking about making renovations to their homes, particularly those individuals who have seen their mobility decline over a period of time. They want to go to the local Home Hardware in Peterborough or Home Depot or Rona—which is Canadian-owned. I do encourage people to go to Rona, because it is Canadian-owned. They're looking at those new bathtubs that are designed with the door to go in and out. That will allow seniors who have mobility issues—if they have arthritis and their mobility has declined—an opportunity to stay at home, to utilize those newly designed bathtubs and showers. Many of them can take advantage of discounts that are in place right now through Home Depot, Rona and other home organizations that specialize in this type of equipment. So there's the opportunity to take advantage of this, going back to October 1, 2011. I encourage people to keep their receipts, put them away in a little file, to make sure that they fill them out and take advantage of this very popular healthy homes renovation tax credit that our government introduced.

Look, I'm talking to the people of Peterborough riding, through you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to remind them to get out, go to Home Hardware, go to Home Depot, go to Rona, get this new equipment, put it in your homes, keep tradespeople working and take advantage of this home renovation tax credit.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** This is truly is a great program in so many different ways. I know we've heard some comments on the other side that it doesn't help certain seniors, and that may very well be true. It may not be helping everybody out there, but it will be helping those seniors who have wanted to do something in their home to make it more energy-efficient, to allow them to stay in their own homes a little bit longer.

Speaker, survey after survey clearly shows that if you give people a choice as to whether or not they should go into a retirement home or into a long-term-care home, they prefer to stay in their own homes.

*Interjection:* Absolutely.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** Absolutely. Everybody prefers to stay in their own home, provided they've got the support mechanism. That's why the CCACs around this province are doing such good work. They should be doing more, and certainly we hope to increase home care so people can stay in their own homes longer.

It's very interesting, Speaker: When you look at the admission rate to long-term-care homes, when I first got started in this business a long time ago, probably in the stone age or whatever, the average age of a person going into a long-term-care home was around 70 or 71. Currently, it's much closer to 90. That basically means that people want to stay in their own home, provided that they've got the amenities there that will allow them to do that.

Certainly, this kind of a grant I realize perhaps not everybody can take advantage of, but those people who will be able to take advantage of that to get their renovations done, to get the necessary tax credits—it's something that they will benefit from. As has already been mentioned, there are many other organizations that will benefit from it as well. For example, there will be more supplies bought at the various repair shops. There will be more service individuals and handymen and carpenters and electricians involved. It keeps everybody working, so this is a good program.

I know, Speaker, that everybody in the House, at the end of the day, will vote for this program.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Trinity—Spadina.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Yes, sir?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Could we keep it down, please?

Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** My concern is this, and I respect the fact that the member opposite, the Attorney General, has also highlighted this issue: There are many people who may not be able to take advantage of this plan; there are many people who don't have the resources to invest in their home.

If there is a shortfall or if there's a case where there is money left over, what type of assurances can we have that this money is used to benefit Ontarians? I'd like to see some sort of guarantee that this money is used to assist seniors in other ways, like home care, seniors' care; that it's used to assist people who are struggling to make their ends meet; that it's to assist people who can't pay their bills, people who are struggling to afford their medical bills, their drugs, their prescriptions. That's something that's of great importance to me. It's of great importance to the people of Ontario that the funds that are allocated for this plan are used in a way that truly helps Ontarians; that truly helps seniors, not just the seniors who can afford to spend thousands of dollars on home improvement; that it assists those seniors who don't have the means to do so; that it assists those who are hardest off and those people whom we have the obligation to assist the most: those who are most vulnerable in our society.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Response, please. No response? No response.

Further debate.

**Ms. Sarah Campbell:** I rise today in response to Bill 2, the Healthy Homes Renovation Tax Credit Act.

This being my first opportunity to speak in the House at length, I would like to take the opportunity to thank the voters of Kenora-Rainy River for their support. I wanted to start off by saying that a few years ago, I would never have dreamed that I would be standing here today giving my inaugural speech, because it has always been my preference to get involved behind the scenes, to always work to improve the lives of people living in my community and my region, but this is something that, like I said, I really had no aspirations for.

Fortunately I had a good mentor, and I'd like to take this opportunity to recognize and thank my predecessor, Mr. Howard Hampton, for the work that he has done in my riding and for northern Ontario as a whole—and actually for all of Ontario, for his time as leader. Mr. Hampton was a fierce champion of our northern identity. It was he who encouraged me to turn my passion for my community and my region into an opportunity to effect change on a larger scale and bring that here to Queen's Park.

1620

I'm not sure if Mr. Hampton knows it, but in many ways he's the reason why I'm here. It's not necessarily that he encouraged me to run or that he provided me with an opportunity to get my feet wet by working in his constituency office, but by shaping my politics.

Growing up, I used to sit around the table with my grandparents in Atikokan, and they liked to share stories with me and discuss the news. These stories shaped who I am today, and many of them were centred on my grandmother's experiences growing up in Miscampbell, which is a township just outside of Fort Frances. To this day, I recall her memories of her neighbours the Hamptons, who owned the general store down the road. For her, it was the simple things that made the difference

while she grew up during the Great Depression, like including candy at no charge in her family's grocery orders. At that time her family, like so many Canadians, had a difficult time making ends meet, and the candy was treated as gold and really savoured among her siblings. Her stories taught me that simple acts of kindness can improve the lives of others in ways that we may not fully appreciate, and that these acts of kindness are the basis for community.

Life in the north has always involved hard work, dedication and a will to triumph over adversity. We in the north are a resilient people, but we also are people who value community. We help our neighbours and we step up to meet challenges as a community. Those stories taught me that by working together we can meet any challenge, that leadership is not the act of telling someone what to do, but inspiring others to work together for positive change. Howard Hampton was a leader in that sense. He inspired others to work together and build a strong and proud northern Ontario. He may not know it, but when my grandparents spoke fondly of their neighbours the Hamptons, they spoke extra fondly of their son Howard, who had helped them over the years with WSIB cases and other things. It is an honour and privilege to have the opportunity to build on his great legacy in the north and here in Queen's Park.

I spoke about my grandparents, and I think it's fitting that I spoke about them in response to a bill where its proponents say that it's been developed to help seniors. Both of my grandmothers still live in Atikokan, and while the population is aging across the province, communities in the north are aging at a faster rate. It's not so much that there was a large boom in the north where we had a lot more children 60 or 70 years ago; it's more that young people are leaving our communities. As little as five or six years ago, students would graduate high school, head off to university and come back for the summers, and then they'd find a job in the community where they grew up. Twenty years ago, it was not uncommon for similar students to graduate high school, walk down the road and get a job at a local paper or sawmill. Neither of those things is happening today. People are still graduating high school, but that's the last we see of them. They don't come back for the summers anymore because there aren't summer jobs to be had. They don't walk down the road to the mill to get a job anymore because there aren't jobs there either—if the mill even exists, which in many cases they don't.

We in the north have an aging population, it's true; and we are aging exponentially faster because of the youth who are leaving our communities. But our story is much different than the one that the government is trying to portray through this bill. You see, Speaker, in order for people to benefit from this program, they need to have the money up front. If they've got the money, that's great; then they can renovate their homes, they can make them more accessible and then, come tax time, they can receive their rebate in the mail.

The problem is that many seniors and many northerners do not have the money. When the forest industry

vanished, so did a lot of seniors' pensions. Just a couple of weeks ago, I met with a large group of mill retirees in Fort Frances. None of those seniors would be able to afford to take advantage of this credit. They spent decades working hard, paying taxes and building a life for themselves and their families, and the money they thought was going to be there when they retired is gone, vanished into thin air because the pensions were never properly funded. The promises that were made to them when they bargained in good faith many years ago have gone into thin air because the plans that were in place assumed a thriving forest industry, and that simply is not the case anymore.

Speaker, when you say "pension" in the north, you're not actually saying "pension"; you're saying "reduced pension." People who thought that they would be able to retire in comfort are retiring in poverty because at least 18% of the income that is supposed to be in the pension fund simply isn't, and many seniors are left unable to take advantage of this credit. Even worse, seniors cannot afford to pay their bills. That's why a couple of years ago, dozens of seniors and non-seniors came out on a windy and snowy November day, when temperatures hovered around minus 40—and I think that minus 40 is probably a temperature that many people in this room right now cannot fully appreciate. They can't comprehend it.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** It's cold.

**Ms. Sarah Campbell:** It's very, very cold. Dozens of seniors huddled together to ask one thing, and that thing was not a tax rebate for their homes. They were asking for lower hydro bills. Rather than being inside and comfortable, these seniors were so fed up that they braved winter weather—weather that even the most hardy of us shudder to think about—because they can't afford to heat their homes, let alone talk about renovating them.

So let me tell you something. There is nothing more heart-breaking than sitting in a room with somebody who has worked hard their entire life, paid their dues, and who is in tears and facing complete and total desperation because they can't pay a bill that's deemed to be an essential service. You don't know what it's like to hear a senior who has had their pension reduced, whose home is in need of repair, who can barely feed themselves and they can't afford to pay their hydro bill, and for you to have to tell them that there's nothing that can be done to help.

They don't want to be told that if they pay a few thousand dollars upfront, they may get a couple of hundred dollars eight months from now. They don't want to hear that one of the few couples who still have a decent pension and can afford to do it are renovating their home while they are left heating their homes with space heaters because the furnace died and there aren't any funds to help them purchase a new one.

But it appears that these people don't matter to this government. It appears that they don't factor into the equation. It seems that this program, which should help people in need—it doesn't. It seems that as long as the

government can make it look like they're doing something, it doesn't matter if anything is actually trickling down and helping people in need.

To put it bluntly, this bill doesn't help those who need it. Taking the HST off home heating would help a bit. Taking the HST off hydro would help as well. Or, dare I even suggest it, the novel idea of charging people in my region the cost of producing hydro would be a start. In my region, we produce some of the cleanest and cheapest electricity in the world but we're not paying those prices. We have our own grid, we have our own infrastructure, but instead we're lumped into a pricing formula that makes no logical sense at all.

Why are people in Ear Falls, who could literally run an extension cord into the source of their electricity, paying \$100 a month for the delivery of their hydro? It does not make sense. I suppose it makes sense to someone, and most likely that person is probably sitting at a desk in southern Ontario. But are they asking themselves: "Does this make sense? Does it accomplish any of our goals?"

There are people in Red Lake living off social assistance, living in subsidized housing, who pay less than \$100 per month for rent because they can't afford it, but their hydro bills are \$800. How does this make sense?

Are people in the north upset? Yes, I would say that they are. I think that they have every right to be upset. We have a government that believes that a one-size-fits-all scheme works for the entire province of Ontario, and it doesn't.

I wish I could stand here today and say some nice pleasantries about how this is my first speech and how everything is great, especially in northern Ontario, but I can't, because the truth is, things are not okay. We in northern Ontario want to be heard, and it's time that this government and its ministries started to listen.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from York West.

**Mr. Mario Sergio:** I think it's quite fitting to welcome Ms. Campbell, the member from Kenora-Rainy River. It's also very notable to know that she had no intention of running for election and getting elected. She wanted to serve the people in her community. But, of course, the better side took over and she's here today and I think the people of Kenora-Rainy River—

*Applause.*

1630

**Mr. Mario Sergio:** Yes. And as she said, she comes from a good school. Mr. Hampton was an outstanding member, not only in the House but as the member serving the people of Kenora-Rainy River. And I'm sure that Ms. Campbell, the member from Kenora-Rainy River today will do extremely well. Every member comes to this House with all the best wishes of doing the very best for their community, and no doubt she will be doing that. And as someone who was part of both sides of the House, the main thing is to speak on behalf of the people that send us to this particular place to serve them.

With respect to the bill, I have to say to the member that there's no difference between the seniors in Kenora-Rainy River or in York West or any other area. Seniors in need are seniors in need, and I think they should make available to them everything possible to make their life as comfortable in their own home as long as they can. Of course, everything this government and others—present, past, future—don't do things to affect every single person. They may be seniors that will benefit in some other areas. These particular seniors with this particular bill I'm sure will find good things to come to them if they can avail. Again, I would like to welcome the member for Kenora-Rainy River.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** I'd like to congratulate the member on a tremendous first maiden speech in this chamber—very well done. I'm very pleased to see you. You're a nice young woman from the north. You fought to get here. Now, my first maiden speech—of course, I yell a lot more than you do; you're a bit more calm. The person I remember responding to me was Peter Kormos, the former member from Welland, who of course was as colourful as I guess I can be from time to time. He gave me great advice: "Never lose sight of why you are here."

I too followed in the footsteps of a great titan who was very well known in my riding, John Baird, as you did with Howard Hampton. Let me say this: In another year or two, that will be your riding, Ms. Campbell; it won't be Howard Hampton's. So keep up the good work, congratulations and I know that everybody at home who is watching you is very proud of you today.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I also would like to congratulate my seatmate, the member from Kenora-Rainy River and would like to comment on the members for York West and Nepean-Carleton. As a fellow northerner—and I've been to Dryden, I've been to Atitokan, I've been to the Fort—I have a little bit of understanding of the places she represents. One thing that's incredible about that riding is that she has 30-some communities or more that are fly-in. Being from northern Ontario, even I can't comprehend that. At least I can drive everywhere. So that is an incredible riding. To be able to represent that riding, to be able to get elected in that riding is a feat in itself. I do come after a member who was in for a long time. He wasn't from our party—

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** He was at one time.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I stepped into that. But it's not easy, regardless what party they're from, it's not easy stepping into a riding that had been well represented by somebody for a long time. It's really hard, because they're used to the way the other person did things, and no matter how you do it, there are going to be questions. But I know the new member is up to it. Once again, I'm very proud to be sitting next to her and to share the same party affiliation. Thank you very much.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further comments? Questions or comments? If not, the member for Kenora-Rainy River.

**Ms. Sarah Campbell:** I'd like to thank the members for their support and words of encouragement; I appreciate that.

I spent a fair bit of time talking about my riding and how things are difficult for the seniors who live in Kenora-Rainy River and across the north. But what I think also needs to be said—I agree that seniors everywhere are facing the same challenges. I'd venture to say that in addition to being concerned about the seniors in my riding and the seniors in everybody's riding, what we need to do is to step things up. I think we need to stop playing politics and we need to start genuinely helping Ontarians. I'm under no illusion that we can maybe come up with a program that would help each and every single person, but I think the system is so broken right now that there are too many people falling through the cracks. The cracks are sometimes, it seems, like a mile wide. So that's why I'm here: to help improve things for seniors, not just in my riding, not just seniors, but to improve the lives of all Ontarians.

I'm very grateful to be here and again I want to thank the constituents of Kenora-Rainy River for allowing me to be here, and I look forward to working with everyone on all sides of the House and all parties in the best interests of Ontarians.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate? Last call. Further debate?

*Interjections.*

**Mr. John O'Toole:** Two days, and you can't fill the time yet.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** I would appreciate it if the member from Durham would try to be a little more kosher, and the other members don't rile up the member.

The member from Carleton-Mississippi Mills may continue—he's a member of your party.

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak to the Healthy Homes Renovation Tax Credit Act. I speak in opposition to this act. I think it's a bad idea, and I think we cannot afford it.

It's an act to help seniors supposedly renovate their homes to improve mobility, accessibility and functionality in their homes up to \$10,000 of expense, and 15% of that expense could be a refund to the homeowner who fixes their home. The problem with that is only the people that have the cash, the \$10,000, can access the refund, so really it's a program to help wealthy people or people that have money or even a house. It does nothing for those people who are poor and don't have the cash to do the renovations. It's estimated to cost as much as \$135 million, and we can't afford \$135 million; a fellow named Mr. Drummond has outlined that for us this week.

I'd like to tell you a couple of stories of people in my riding who are examples of people that cannot take advantage of that program because they do not have the money. They're not wealthy; in fact, they're poor.

Joyce Nightingale is a lady in my riding who is 75 years old. She is one of the bravest, strongest, most principled people I've ever met. Unfortunately, life has not been kind to her. She is not prosperous. Her marriage failed, and her husband didn't treat her very well as the marriage was failing. She has a cottage, but she does not have a house. She does not have money; she has trouble even paying utility bills. One of her best friends who has fared better and does have a house and the means to live better has invited Joyce to live with her at her home through the winter months, and so Joyce does that.

This is truly an example of neighbours helping neighbours and community looking after those in need, and I think it's an example of what has to be done more in Ontario, because government increasingly is going to be unable to help people. We have flawed programs that do not deliver help where it's needed, and actually the money is wasted. That money would be better spent on lowering debt. Joyce's neighbours help her, and it worked successfully and actually builds a wonderful community spirit.

Another fellow in my riding named Larry Torrington, who was in dire straits recently, was helped by the Ontario Landowners Association. Last March, poor Larry—he has diabetes—had a leg amputated below the knee. He was in the hospital all summer recovering, recuperating from the loss of his leg.

On Labour Day he was told by the doctor that he was well enough to go home to his house, where he lives with his wife. But he was in a wheelchair, because he's now handicapped, and he didn't have the money, which was \$5,000, to build a ramp to go into his house.

The March of Dimes is an organization that comes up with money to help people like that occasionally. Unfortunately, they didn't have any money to help Larry. So he ended up staying in the hospital all fall until a week before Christmas, which was \$850 a day. It came to about \$90,000 that was spent by the provincial government on health care that he didn't need, plus that bed wasn't available to a truly sick person and he was going to be staying there for another few months until the March of Dimes or some group had the money to build a ramp for him. So the Ontario Landowners Association was called by a reporter who said, "What do you think of that?"

Anyway, this group of people—I co-operated and helped a little bit because we heard about the story—built the ramp for Larry. We said that rather than blame government for doing a bad thing—it was just before Christmas—it was time to do something nice for a neighbour who was in need. It was an obvious need, and it was a small need, so we volunteered labour. We went to Home Depot and said, "Could you help us with some materials?" They gave us the materials at 80% off cost, so they were really good citizens, great for the community. Over the weekend, seven of us built the ramp. We were all over 60 years old, and we were all very proud of that; the fact that we lived this long is one point. So we haven't been a burden on health care yet. But we

got a great sense of community feeling out of building this ramp for Larry. We got him home three days before Christmas. We sang Christmas carols and had a few speeches from the new deck. It was a wonderful experience, and everybody felt very rewarded, and Larry got home for Christmas with his family. The cost was \$400.

**1640**

We used it as a bit of a fundraiser to help other people like Larry get out of the hospital. That's another example of how we can help people in our community without government, and it actually makes our community stronger because we build a sense of community spirit, and that's the way it's got to be done. Too often, as government, we try to do too much, and I don't think we're suited to do all things properly—certainly not cheaply, certainly not efficiently, and sometimes we miss the goal completely.

**Ms. Laurie Scott:** Well said, Jack.

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** Thank you.

Another bill where I think money is being wasted and could be better spent is Bill 11, the Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act. It's the eastern Ontario economic development fund and the southwestern economic development fund. Being from eastern Ontario, it would be very easy for me to say, "Oh, great, we get some money to give away to businesses to create jobs." In fact, most of the time what happens with that is the businesses that are going to add on an addition to their factory or their office or whatever it might be are going to do it anyways, because they're making money, because they're good managers and they have a successful business plan. But if they can get money out of government, it would be good business to take that money. It's a bad plan, so I'm opposed to that, and we can't afford that amount of money. It's some tens of millions—I don't know exactly, but that should, again, be put back towards paying down debt.

The Drummond report identified for us that we have a huge deficit and huge debt. We've been hearing an awful lot about that over the last week. It's going to be \$411 billion—if we don't do anything, it will hit that level in five years—and \$30 billion of deficit. We are hitting the wall financially, and something has got to be done. So far, we just don't see the people across the hall biting into that bullet and agreeing that, "Yes, we're going to do that." I'm hoping they change their minds, and with the budget, they come out and do the right thing. These programs have to be killed because we can't afford it, and they're not delivering the goods.

One of the problems is our demographics are changing in Ontario. We're getting older. The baby boomers are getting older. Pretty soon they're going to need health care, and then our children are going to be the taxpayers, and there's fewer of them. So there's going to be more sick people and fewer taxpayers, and that's just not going to work, folks. So we have to do something, and we have to do something quickly, and it has to be significant, because we're starting out in a hole as we head into a

dark time as far as income and expenses go, and there has got to be some serious rationalization going on here to fix these problems.

The Drummond report is just telling us what we already know, that we are in trouble. It doesn't go far enough. We've got to do things like wage freezes for public servants. We've got to kill the Green Energy Act, because we cannot afford that. We've got to sell the Liquor Control Board, because it's time to do that, and the government shouldn't be in the business anyway. That would give us, I'm told, \$10 billion of cash, which would be one year's interest on the debt.

We've got to create jobs. We should be killing the College of Trades legislation. We should be reducing the construction journeyman-apprenticeship ratio of 3 to 1 down to 1 to 1. We estimate, as PCs, that that would create 200,000 jobs. We've got to create wealth—taxes. That will help solve our problems.

We need to get rid of red tape. It will free companies up to do the business of doing business and creating jobs and creating wealth. We need to make people free to be innovative and creative.

We need to reduce the size and cost of government, and we just can't afford big government anymore. And we can't afford any more scandals: no more eHealth, no more Ornge. That just sucks the money, adds to our debt, adds to our deficit.

Hydro costs are too high. People can't afford them. We heard in the north that's one of our big problems; that's a problem everywhere. I live in the Ottawa area, and if I look across the river, I see Hydro Quebec over there. We can get five-cent hydro, and why we're not getting it, I don't know. We run hydro lines right through eastern Ontario and sell it to New York and the New England states cheap. Cornwall is buying it right now and has since 1920. So all we have to do is get our city of Ottawa to do that, and we'd be all set. That's my good friend Jim Watson, and I'm sure he'll return my call.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Give Jim a call.

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** I will. He owes me breakfast. We'll have a good time.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I'll call him right away. We'll get you breakfast.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Order, please.

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** Thank you.

So we need cheaper electricity because people just can't afford these high electricity rates. We can't afford the \$135 million we're spending for this piece of legislation that would be better put towards things like home care and long-term care.

Where else are we here? We need to stop this 30% tuition grant as well. That's money we can't afford to spend. We can't be buying things we can't afford.

Other areas of health care that need to be addressed are autism, teenage mental illness—I ran into these during campaigning, and people have called my office. We hear some very sad stories. We've had teenage mental illness here in this chamber, with Allan Hubley

before Christmas, so we know first-hand what a terrible thing that is for families. I've run into families with autistic children, and there's precious little help from government for them. So there's a lot of people who need to be helped by us, and they've been neglected so far because they're not pretty or attractive types of diseases.

Bill 2 has to be stopped. We can't afford it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Thank you. Questions and comments? The Attorney General.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** I'd like to thank the member for his maiden speech, as well as the member before that from Kenora—Rainy River.

It's kind of interesting in this House, but you learn after a while—and it's kind of unfortunate. Everybody, when you first come here, wants to make changes to the system. We all have great energy to do that. The problem is that anything that's proposed from this side has to be opposed over there, and vice versa. I'm telling you, Speaker, in the long run that isn't the way it should work.

You may have some good ideas. We have some good ideas. We can support one another in these ideas. Certainly a program like this that helps senior citizens do the necessary renovations in their homes—it's not going to help everybody; I realize that—to make it more energy efficient, to make it more user-friendly is a good program, and nobody can argue about that. We're not talking about rich people here. We're talking about people who have \$10,000 that they could spend on upgrading their home rather than moving into an apartment, a senior citizens' home or whatever.

Let me just get back to the member from Kenora—Rainy River and her maiden speech. It was an excellent speech. She speaks very passionately about her community. What I really liked about what she had to say is that she has been a constituency assistant, and I think in this House we have to recognize all of the main work that's being done in our offices on a day-to-day basis, and that the people who try to make us look as good as possible are our constituency assistants. Any assistant I've had over the years—and I've had a few of them, although most of them have stayed with me over the years—are always surprised at the magnitude and differences in questions and concerns that are brought to them on a day-to-day basis.

I just want to congratulate both members on their maiden speeches. I would suggest to them, don't always necessarily assume that because it comes from the government, it's bad, or that your ideas are good. There's good and bad on all sides. This is a good program, so vote for it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further questions and comments? Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** I'd like to respond.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member will sit down for a second. Questions and comments? No more questions and comments?

You have a two-minute response, member from Carleton—Mississippi Mills.

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll learn the rules pretty soon.

I'd just like to respond to the member from Kingston and the Islands. This wasn't my maiden speech, but thank you for the comment. That's tomorrow morning. If you'd like to come tomorrow morning, I'll buy you breakfast and we'll talk about it.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** Only if Jim comes along.

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** Okay.

I'm not opposed to the bill just because it's Liberal. I'm opposed to the bill because we can't afford it and it doesn't help the people it should.

I'll end at that point. I will look forward to chatting with you further some day.

**Interjection:** Further debate?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further debate? Thank you, House leader.

**Ms. Lisa M. Thompson:** Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak about the healthy homes renovation tax credit because, quite frankly, I'm concerned about this bill.

Bill 2 comes at a time when we in Huron–Bruce and throughout the province are faced with a very serious spending crisis, and we simply cannot afford to direct money in this manner when we have unprecedented challenges in our health care system that require long-term vision to come up with affordable solutions.

1650

Just last week, Mr. Drummond warned in his report that Liberal spending needs to be reined in immediately, yet here we are still talking about spending more money. The healthy home credit will cost \$60 million in its first six months of implementation—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** We have a couple of sidebars, and your own member is trying to give a speech. So maybe we could take the sidebars outside the Legislature. Thank you.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** They could be outside bars.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** That's right. Thank you.

**Ms. Lisa M. Thompson:** Mr. Speaker, this program fails to take into account the big picture. At a time when the province is facing a \$16-billion deficit, we can't fix all problems by throwing money at them.

**Interjection.**

**Ms. Lisa M. Thompson:** Oh, I could talk about that. We're growing another 24% without any government assistance.

When we look specifically at health care costs, we see that they are rising at unsustainable rates. Health is the biggest item in the government's budget, accounting for 40.3% of total program spending. The government spent \$44.8 billion on health care in 2010-11. Mr. Drummond calls this an ever more costly trajectory, and he predicts that health care costs will reach \$62.5 billion by 2017-18 if we don't stop this madness. His report calls for health spending to be reined in to an annual increase of 2.5%. This is in stark contrast to our current rate of increase at

4.9%, which promises to bankrupt our province if we continue on this path.

In this context, when I'm speaking to the good folks of Huron–Bruce or across the province, goat farmers etc., it's hard to justify this price tag for this healthy home tax credit, when there's nothing healthy about it at all. It will cost the government \$135 million per year to cover this credit. Moreover, the details on this program haven't been provided, so we don't even know the source of funds other than that these funds will be moving from other program areas, probably where we need it most.

The government needs to ask itself, "Will this credit benefit our province at a time when we are facing serious budgetary crises—ballooning health costs, out of control energy costs and a job crisis?" But unfortunately, the answer I believe we're going to get, Mr. Speaker, from the government is no, they will not. They need to ask our government, why not help all Ontario families by implementing an all-encompassing benefit? For example, if the government has \$135 million to spend, then why not remove the HST from electricity or heating bills to give all taxpayers some relief from their rising energy bills under that costly green energy plan? If you will recall, in my maiden speech I noted that my 96-year-old grandmother lives on her own near McIntosh in Huron county. She again, as we were visiting with our leader, Tim Hudak, just a couple of weeks ago, expressed the need to have relief from her ever-rising energy costs.

Again, will our government listen? I'm afraid not if they continue with this particular credit. This credit does nothing—does very little for Ontario's budgetary crisis, as I've mentioned, and it does little in terms of immediate relief from escalating energy bills for the aging population.

In fact, the Liberal Aging at Home strategy has been a dismal failure, costing an estimated \$1 billion. In December 2010, the Auditor General found that 10,000 people are still waiting for home care. That is why we need long-term affordable, viable plans.

Mr. Drummond says that a vital first step in health care is a long-term view. In his report, he calls on the government to develop a 20-year plan—a "plan that will, though it involves tough decisions in the short term, deliver a superior health care system down the road." What we don't need is window dressing, and that's what this healthy homes tax credit really is. It's window dressing. It's a short-term tax credit for a small pocket of seniors and their children, and that is a short-term approach that we cannot afford.

We can add the healthy homes tax credit to a long list of Liberal tax benefits that pick and choose winners and losers. For example, they promised to cut tuition fees for college and university students by 30% in their last election campaign. As it turns out, only one in three students is benefiting from this program once you read the restrictions and the fine print.

This healthy homes tax credit is not a solution to the economic problems that everyday Ontarians are facing, nor will it help our seniors who are facing health challenges as they age. Like the tuition credit, it applies

only to a tiny segment of their population. Wealthier seniors will renovate regardless. Poor seniors will not be able to afford to spend \$10,000 to cash in on this proposed tax credit. Therefore, it does not make sense.

This selective approach is not sustainable in the long term. The number of seniors is expected to double over the next decade. If the government is serious about helping seniors, the healthy homes tax credit is not the way forward.

So I'm asking: Why could the government not afford addressing real help for seniors? For example, they should be easing wait times for long-term-care spaces. Right now, it's my understanding that seniors are forced to wait up to 173 days. In the riding of Huron-Bruce, we're told, long-term beds are not an option at this time, and it's a terrific need that we need to be addressing. It's shameful that the government does not have the foresight to look long term.

The Drummond report dedicated 105 recommendations to health care. Did it recommend a healthy homes credit for seniors? No, it did not. It called for an across-the-board review of health care. We need a long-term, integrated, sustainable health care plan.

This proposed healthy homes credit is a one-off measure that adds to our broken health care system. Mr. Drummond calls this health care system "a series of disjointed services in many silos." Mr. Drummond says we are not getting value for money, relative to other jurisdictions. We have fewer physicians per capita than continental European countries, and compensation for hospitals and physicians should be tied to patient outcomes. In this economic context, with a debt-ridden province, we need to re-evaluate how we are spending our money in health care.

The healthy homes tax credit will cost, again, \$135 million per year that we can't afford. And we need to remember that a \$1,500 home renovation tax credit does not equal quality home care. There's a big difference there.

Mr. Drummond also warns that too often, treatment delayed is treatment diminished. Seniors are waiting an average of 173 days, as I've said previously, for long-term-care beds. In December 2010, the Auditor General also found that 10,000 people were waiting for home care. We've seen across the board that these measures aren't working.

What about a regional strategy? Rural needs are different than urban needs. As we heard in our colleague's main speech, northern needs are different from southwestern Ontario's needs.

Mr. Drummond says investments are needed to develop community resources and clinics at a local level. He also calls on the government to implement the findings from Dr. David Walker's report, *Caring for Our Aging Population and Addressing Alternate Levels of*

Care, which was submitted to the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. Dr. Walker's report says that if we want to keep seniors in their homes longer, we need a comprehensive approach, with a broad view of factors influencing health, including physical, social, nutritional, emotional, health care professional and caregiver needs. A \$1,500 tax credit does not equal a comprehensive approach.

I ask the government: Will you please do the right thing? Dollars would be better spent if they were to go into proactive measures to stop health care problems before they develop. We need to address socio-economic issues before they manifest in health problems in our vulnerable populations. We need to minimize the costs of long-term, complex illnesses.

Please, Mr. Speaker, ask the government to do the right thing.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I just want to correct Hansard. Inadvertently, I gave the wrong phone number to the member for Carleton-Mississippi Mills. I think I gave him the phone number for the Right Honourable Stephen Harper, so I want to correct the record. The mayor's office is 1-613-580-2496. I apologize if any calls went in to the Right Honourable Stephen Harper.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Thank you. Any further questions and answers?

Seeing none, Mr. Milloy has moved second reading of Bill 2, An Act to amend the Taxation Act, 2007 to implement a healthy homes renovation tax credit. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I heard a no.

All those in favour of the motion will say "aye."

All those opposed will say "nay."

I believe the ayes have it.

Seeing five members, we'll call in the members. This will be a 30-minute bell.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Mr. Speaker, I can help you out.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Thank you. Mr. Leal has given me a deferral until tomorrow after question period. Is it the pleasure of the House that this carry? Carried.

*Second reading vote deferred.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Orders of the day?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The Minister of Housing has moved adjournment of the House. All in favour? Carried.

This House stands adjourned until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

*The House adjourned at 1701.*

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO**  
**ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: Hon. / L'hon. David C. Onley, O.Ont.

Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Dave Levac

Clerk / Greffière: Deborah Deller

Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman, Tonia Grannum

Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Albanese, Laura (LIB)	York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston	
Armstrong, Teresa J. (NDP)	London–Fanshawe	
Arnott, Ted (PC)	Wellington–Halton Hills	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée
Bailey, Robert (PC)	Sarnia–Lambton	
Balkissoon, Bas (LIB)	Scarborough–Rouge River	Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée Deputy Speaker / Vice-président
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand–Norfolk	
Bartolucci, Hon. / L'hon. Rick (LIB)	Sudbury	Chair of Cabinet / Président du Conseil des ministres Minister of Northern Development and Mines / Ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
Bentley, Hon. / L'hon. Christopher (LIB)	London West / London-Ouest	Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie
Berardinetti, Lorenzo (LIB)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	
Best, Hon. / L'hon. Margaret R. (LIB)	Scarborough–Guildwood	Minister of Consumer Services / Ministre des Services aux consommateurs
Bisson, Gilles (NDP)	Timmins–James Bay / Timmins–Baie James	House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire de parti reconnu
Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (LIB)	St. Catharines	Minister of the Environment / Ministre de l'Environnement Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
Broten, Hon. / L'hon. Laurel C. (LIB)	Etobicoke–Lakeshore	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation Minister Responsible for Women's Issues / Ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Campbell, Sarah (NDP)	Kenora–Rainy River	
Cansfield, Donna H. (LIB)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	
Chan, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)	Markham–Unionville	Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport / Ministre de Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport
Chiarelli, Hon. / L'hon. Bob (LIB)	Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Minister of Infrastructure / Ministre de l'Infrastructure Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Halton	
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds–Grenville	
Colle, Mike (LIB)	Eglinton–Lawrence	
Coteau, Michael (LIB)	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	
Crack, Grant (LIB)	Glengarry–Prescott–Russell	
Craitor, Kim (LIB)	Niagara Falls	
Damerla, Dipika (LIB)	Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville	
Delaney, Bob (LIB)	Mississauga–Streetsville	
Dhillon, Vic (LIB)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Dickson, Joe (LIB)	Ajax–Pickering	
DiNovo, Cheri (NDP)	Parkdale–High Park	
Duguid, Hon. / L'hon. Brad (LIB)	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Minister of Economic Development and Innovation / Ministre du Développement économique et de l'Innovation
Duncan, Hon. / L'hon. Dwight (LIB)	Windsor–Tecumseh	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / Président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement Deputy Premier / Vice-premier ministre Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances
Dunlop, Garfield (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	
Elliott, Christine (PC)	Whitby–Oshawa	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Fedeli, Victor (PC)	Nipissing	
Flynn, Kevin Daniel (LIB)	Oakville	
Forster, Cindy (NDP)	Welland	Deputy House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire adjointe de parti reconnu
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	
<b>Gerretsen, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles	Attorney General / Procureur général
<b>Gravelle, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Thunder Bay–Superior North / Thunder Bay–Superior-Nord	Minister of Natural Resources / Ministre des Richesses naturelles
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	
Harris, Michael (PC)	Kitchener–Conestoga	
Hillier, Randy (PC)	Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington	
Horwath, Andrea (NDP)	Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre	Leader, Recognized Party / Chef de parti reconnu
<b>Hoskins, Hon. / L'hon. Eric (LIB)</b>	St. Paul's	Leader, New Democratic Party of Ontario / Chef du Nouveau parti démocratique de l'Ontario Minister of Children and Youth Services / Ministre des Services à l'enfance et à la jeunesse
Hudak, Tim (PC)	Niagara West–Glanbrook / Niagara-Ouest–Glanbrook	Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle Leader, Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur de l'Ontario
Jackson, Rod (PC)	Barrie	
Jaczek, Helena (LIB)	Oak Ridges–Markham	
<b>Jeffrey, Hon. / L'hon. Linda (LIB)</b>	Brampton–Springdale	Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail Minister Responsible for Seniors / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires des personnes âgées
Jones, Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin–Caledon	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Klees, Frank (PC)	Newmarket–Aurora	
Kwinter, Monte (LIB)	York Centre / York-Centre	
Leal, Jeff (LIB)	Peterborough	
Leone, Rob (PC)	Cambridge	
<b>Levac, Hon. / L'hon. Dave (LIB)</b>	Brant	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
MacCharles, Tracy (LIB)	Pickering–Scarborough East / Pickering–Scarborough-Est	
MacLaren, Jack (PC)	Carleton–Mississippi Mills	
MacLeod, Lisa (PC)	Nepean–Carleton	
Mangat, Amrit (LIB)	Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud	
Mantha, Michael (NDP)	Algoma–Manitoulin	
Marchese, Rosario (NDP)	Trinity–Spadina	
<b>Matthews, Hon. / L'hon. Deborah (LIB)</b>	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / Ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Mauro, Bill (LIB)	Thunder Bay–Atikokan	
McDonell, Jim (PC)	Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry	
<b>McGuinty, Hon. / L'hon. Dalton (LIB)</b>	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales Premier / Premier ministre Leader, Government / Chef du gouvernement Leader, Liberal Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti libéral de l'Ontario
McKenna, Jane (PC)	Burlington	
<b>McMeekin, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (LIB)</b>	Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough–Westdale	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
McNaughton, Monte (PC)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	
McNeely, Phil (LIB)	Ottawa–Orléans	
<b>Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (LIB)</b>	Ottawa–Vanier	Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / Ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones
Miller, Norm (PC)	Parry Sound–Muskoka	
<b>Miller, Paul (NDP)</b>	Hamilton East–Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est–Stoney Creek	Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Milligan, Rob E. (PC)	Northumberland—Quinte West	
<b>Milloy, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	Minister of Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Moridi, Reza (LIB)	Richmond Hill	
<b>Munro, Julia (PC)</b>	York—Simcoe	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Murray, Hon. / L'hon. Glen R. (LIB)</b>	Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Naqvi, Yasir (LIB)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	
Natyshak, Taras (NDP)	Essex	
Nicholls, Rick (PC)	Chatham—Kent—Essex	
O'Toole, John (PC)	Durham	
Oraziotti, David (LIB)	Sault Ste. Marie	
Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Oshawa	
Pettapiece, Randy (PC)	Perth—Wellington	
Piruzza, Teresa (LIB)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	
Prue, Michael (NDP)	Beaches—East York	
Qaadri, Shafiq (LIB)	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	
Sandals, Liz (LIB)	Guelph	
Schein, Jonah (NDP)	Davenport	
Scott, Laurie (PC)	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brook	
Sergio, Mario (LIB)	York West / York-Ouest	
Shurman, Peter (PC)	Thornhill	
Singh, Jagmeet (NDP)	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	
Smith, Todd (PC)	Prince Edward—Hastings	
Sorbara, Greg (LIB)	Vaughan	
<b>Sousa, Hon. / L'hon. Charles (LIB)</b>	Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration / Ministre des Affaires civiques et de l'Immigration
Tabuns, Peter (NDP)	Toronto—Danforth	
<b>Takhar, Hon. / L'hon. Harinder S. (LIB)</b>	Mississauga—Erindale	Minister of Government Services / Ministre des Services gouvernementaux
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain	
Thompson, Lisa M. (PC)	Huron—Bruce	
Vanthof, John (NDP)	Timiskaming—Cochrane	
Walker, Bill (PC)	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	
Wilson, Jim (PC)	Simcoe—Grey	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle
Witmer, Elizabeth (PC)	Kitchener—Waterloo	
Wong, Soo (LIB)	Scarborough—Agincourt	
<b>Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (LIB)</b>	Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Yakabuski, John (PC)	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	
Yurek, Jeff (PC)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	
Zimmer, David (LIB)	Willowdale	



## **Kraft Hockeyville 2012**

Mr. Steve Clark ..... 582

## **Ontario Place**

Mr. Rosario Marchese ..... 582

## **Land development**

Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti ..... 583

## **Adam Holmes**

Mr. Toby Barrett ..... 583

## **Islamic Circle of North America**

Ms. Dipika Damerla ..... 583

## **Joe Bahro / Albert Corace**

Ms. Lisa MacLeod ..... 583

## **Private members' public business**

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac) ..... 584

## **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS / DÉPÔT DES PROJETS DE LOI**

### **Security for Courts, Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012, Bill 34,**

**Mrs. Meilleur / Loi de 2012 sur la sécurité des**

**tribunaux, des centrales électriques et des**

**installations nucléaires, projet de loi 34,**

**Mme Meilleur**

First reading agreed to ..... 584

### **Major-General Sir Isaac Brock Day Act, 2012, Bill**

**35, Mr. Clark, Mr. Craitor, Ms. Forster / Loi de**

**2012 sur le Jour du major-général Sir Isaac Brock,**

**projet de loi 35, M. Clark, M. Craitor, Mme**

**Forster**

First reading agreed to ..... 584

Mr. Steve Clark ..... 584

## **STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES / DÉCLARATIONS MINISTÉRIELLES ET RÉPONSES**

### **Black History Month**

Hon. Margaret R. Best ..... 584

### **Sécurité communautaire / Community safety**

L'hon. Madeleine Meilleur ..... 585

### **Black History Month**

Mr. Ted Arnott ..... 587

### **Community safety**

Mr. John Yakubski ..... 587

### **Black History Month**

Mr. Rosario Marchese ..... 588

## **Community safety**

Mr. Taras Natyshak ..... 588

## **PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS**

### **Animal protection**

Mr. Garfield Dunlop ..... 588

### **Wind turbines**

Mr. Todd Smith ..... 589

### **Diagnostic services**

Mme France Gélinas ..... 589

### **Climate change**

Mr. Phil McNeely ..... 589

### **Long-term care**

Mr. Ernie Hardeman ..... 590

### **Environmental protection**

Mr. John O'Toole ..... 590

### **Lyme disease**

Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer ..... 590

### **Kidney disease**

Mr. Jeff Leal ..... 591

### **Hydro dam**

Mr. Ernie Hardeman ..... 591

### **Wind turbines**

Mr. Todd Smith ..... 591

### **Environmental protection**

Mr. John O'Toole ..... 591

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR**

### **Healthy Homes Renovation Tax Credit Act, 2012,**

**Bill 2, Mr. Duncan / Loi de 2012 sur le crédit**

**d'impôt pour l'aménagement du logement axé sur**

**le bien-être, projet de loi 2, M. Duncan**

Mr. Randy Pettapiece ..... 592

Mr. John Vanthof ..... 592

Mr. Jeff Leal ..... 593

Hon. John Gerretsen ..... 593

Mr. Jagmeet Singh ..... 593

Ms. Sarah Campbell ..... 594

Mr. Mario Sergio ..... 595

Ms. Lisa MacLeod ..... 596

Mr. John Vanthof ..... 596

Ms. Sarah Campbell ..... 596

Mr. Jack MacLaren ..... 596

Hon. John Gerretsen ..... 598

Mr. Jack MacLaren ..... 598

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson ..... 599

Second reading vote deferred ..... 600

## CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Wednesday 22 February 2012 / Mercredi 22 février 2012

### ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

#### Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act, 2012, Bill 11, Mr. Duguid / Loi de 2012 visant à attirer les investissements et à créer des emplois, projet de loi 11, M. Duguid

Mr. Rosario Marchese .....	561
Mr. John Yakabuski .....	567
Hon. Christopher Bentley .....	567
Mr. Rob E. Milligan .....	568
M. Taras Natyshak .....	568
Mr. Rosario Marchese .....	568
Hon. John Gerretsen .....	569
Second reading debate deemed adjourned .....	570

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn .....	570
Mr. Reza Moridi .....	571
Mr. Garfield Dunlop .....	571
Mr. Bill Mauro .....	571
Mr. Jim McDonell .....	571
Mr. Jack MacLaren .....	571
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	571
Hon. Glen R. Murray .....	571
Mr. Bob Delaney .....	571
The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac) .....	571

#### Legislative pages

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac) .....	571
-------------------------------------	-----

### ORAL QUESTIONS / QUESTIONS ORALES

#### Public services

Mr. Tim Hudak .....	571
Hon. Dalton McGuinty .....	571

#### Public services

Mr. Tim Hudak .....	572
Hon. Dalton McGuinty .....	572

#### Taxation

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	573
Hon. Dalton McGuinty .....	573

#### Air ambulance service

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	574
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	574

#### Air ambulance service

Mr. Frank Klees .....	575
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	575

#### Air ambulance service

Mme France Gélinas .....	576
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	576

#### Job creation

Mrs. Teresa Piruzza .....	576
Hon. Brad Duguid .....	577

#### Air ambulance service

Mr. Frank Klees .....	577
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	577

#### Air ambulance service

Mr. Jagmeet Singh .....	577
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	577

#### Renewable energy

Mr. Phil McNeely .....	578
Hon. Christopher Bentley .....	578

#### Apprenticeship training

Mr. Garfield Dunlop .....	579
Hon. Dwight Duncan .....	579
Hon. Glen R. Murray .....	579

#### Public transit

Mr. Jonah Schein .....	579
Hon. Bob Chiarelli .....	579

#### Ontario public service

Mrs. Laura Albanese .....	580
Hon. Harinder S. Takhar .....	580

#### Energy policies

Mr. Victor Fedeli .....	580
Hon. Christopher Bentley .....	580

#### Fire safety

Mr. Gilles Bisson .....	581
Hon. Madeleine Meilleur .....	581

### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS / DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

#### Acton Employment Resource Centre

Mr. Ted Arnott .....	581
----------------------	-----

#### Northern Ontario

Mr. Michael Mantha .....	582
--------------------------	-----

#### Family Day

Mr. Monte Kwinter .....	582
-------------------------	-----

*Continued on inside back cover*

120N  
K1  
-D23



No. 15

N° 15

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

First Session, 40<sup>th</sup> Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 40<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Thursday 23 February 2012**

**Jeudi 23 février 2012**



**Speaker  
Honourable Dave Levac**

**Président  
L'honorable Dave Levac**

**Clerk  
Deborah Deller**

**Greffière  
Deborah Deller**

### **Hansard on the Internet**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

### **Le Journal des débats sur Internet**

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

### **Renseignements sur l'index**

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.

---

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services  
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building  
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park  
Toronto ON M7A 1A2  
Telephone 416-325-7400; fax 416-325-7430  
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service du Journal des débats et d'interprétation  
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement  
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park  
Toronto ON M7A 1A2  
Téléphone, 416-325-7400; télécopieur, 416-325-7430  
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 23 February 2012

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Jeudi 23 février 2012

*The House met at 0900.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Please join me in prayer.

*Prayers.*

## MEMBER FOR LANARK–FRONTENAC– LENNOX AND ADDINGTON

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Speaker, I seek unanimous consent that the member for Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington may speak and vote from his place while seated.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** We've been asked for unanimous consent for the member to remain seated during his presentations. Do we have agreement? Agreed.

## COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** I have a motion; I think we have unanimous consent to present this motion from the opposition parties—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Do we have unanimous consent to present the motion? Agreed? Agreed.

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** When I move the motion, I have to read a lot of names. Remember, this is the first time I have read all the names, so if you think you have a hard time, Mr. Speaker, we'll see how I make out.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Jim Wilson's willing to assist.

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** I can say Wilson. I'm used to saying that one.

Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to move government notice of motion 17, and that up to 30 minutes be allotted to debate on the motion, divided equally among the recognized parties, at the end of which time the Speaker shall put the question without amendment.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Is there consent for the motion to be put? Agreed.

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** I move that, notwithstanding standing order 108 and pursuant to standing order 113, the following standing committees be appointed and that the membership of these committees be as follows:

The Standing Committee on Estimates: Kim Craitor, Grant Crack, Vic Dhillon, Mario Sergio, Rob Leone, Rick Nicholls, Michael Harris, Michael Prue, Taras Natyshak;

The Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs: Bob Delaney, Yasir Naqvi, Teresa Piruzza, Soo Wong, Peter Shurman, Monte McNaughton, Vic Fedeli, Michael Prue, Cindy Forster;

The Standing Committee on General Government: David Oraziatti, Michael Coteau, Joe Dickson, David

Zimmer, Laurie Scott, Jeff Yurek, Todd Smith, Rosario Marchese, Sarah Campbell;

The Standing Committee on Government Agencies: Bill Mauro, Donna Cansfield, Helena Jaczek, Phil McNeely, Jim McDonnell, Lisa Thompson, Randy Pettapiece, Peter Tabuns, Monique Taylor;

The Standing Committee on Justice Policy: Laura Albanese, Lorenzo Berardinetti, Mike Colle, Shafiq Qadri, Frank Klees, Jack MacLaren, Rob Milligan, Paul Miller, Teresa Armstrong;

The Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly: Laura Albanese, Bas Balkissoon, Donna Cansfield, Jeff Leal, Garfield Dunlop, Lisa MacLeod, Steve Clark, Gilles Bisson, Jonah Schein;

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts: Phil McNeely, Reza Moridi, Liz Sandals, David Zimmer, Norm Miller, Toby Barrett, Jerry Ouellette, France Gélinas, Jagmeet Singh;

The Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills: Michael Coteau, Grant Crack, Vic Dhillon, Mario Sergio, Randy Hillier, Rod Jackson, Bill Walker, Peter Tabuns, John Vanthof;

Standing Committee on Social Policy: Dipika Damerla, Kevin Flynn, Amrit Mangat, Tracy MacCharles, Ernie Hardeman, Ted Chudleigh, Jane McKenna, Cheri DiNovo, Michael Mantha; and

That, except for its responsibilities set out in standing order 111(b), the Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly shall consider no other business prior to the completion of a study and the tabling of a report on the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and

That, notwithstanding any standing order, no government bill shall be referred to the Standing Committee on Estimates or to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts; and

That, the terms of this motion shall terminate on the day before the first day of the 2012 fall meeting period."

I'm pleased today to stand, on behalf of the government, having gone through that. I think the members of the Legislative Assembly will know when you are actually reading names from a list, they probably end up having a hard time saying "Yakabuski," who is sitting across from me, let alone others, but of course he has been here in this House, and I had the opportunity to serve with his father—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Minister, we have to complete the motion.

Is it the favour of the House that the motion carry?

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** No, you're getting ahead of yourself.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Mr. Bradley has moved motion number 17, and now we will enter into debate.

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Do not delete the name "Yakabuski" from the record. He is here this morning, so his constituents know. He's sitting right across from me trying to throw me off, but he's sitting across from me nevertheless.

I'm pleased to speak on behalf of the government. This morning, I think the members of the assembly will say, "At long last," to establishing this Legislature's nine standing committees. For those who follow the ins and outs of this place, they will know that the three parties have been at, shall we say, something of an impasse—I think might be what we might use—for the past several months over committees, each with an interest in seeing the committees work as well as possible.

I won't go into the details of the impasse. They are details that could leave even the most learned political expert confused. Even my friend Mr. Kormos, who was a previous House leader here, might have struggled on some days with the intricacies of this issue. He is gone from this place, but his spirit revolves somewhere in the building, I think, even though the present member, Ms. Forster, is doing a marvellous job for her constituents. His memory will fade at some point in time; don't worry. There are those who might—

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** That'll be in the leaflet, Jim.

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** That's always dangerous. The interjection was that whenever you say something good about a member of the opposition, it can appear in an election leaflet saying what a good job the person is doing, or in a constituency newsletter.

It says here that there are those who might stand in their place and point out that the agreement we've reached is nearly identical to the agreement the government first put on the table three months ago. I know Mr. Yakabuski was noting that as he walked in this morning.

0910

Now, such a person would say that the opposition has at long last agreed to follow the rules of the House. I wouldn't say that, of course, because that's not really what happened. But the rules say two important things: (1) committees can have no more than nine members; and (2) committee membership must be in proportion to the representation of the parties in the House. I know that that is reflected in this particular motion.

I will say this, however: All of us in this House, I think, have an opportunity at this time. It's an opportunity to make this House and its committees work in a way they haven't in a long time—may I explain briefly for, perhaps, those who might be watching at this time or new members of the House?

My experience has been, particularly in a majority government, that the committees are pretty perfunctory. In other words, the government members tend to pursue the government line and vote with the government, as the

whip says, and the opposition members do the same. There are a lot of windy exchanges, but not necessarily a lot happens, although I think there has been some good work done, particularly by members who have been here a longer time; I would say particularly with, I think, select committees, we've seen some good work done.

What happens in a minority Parliament, in essence, is that the government has to be more responsive to the opposition because the government doesn't have a majority of the votes. The opposition, it means, has to be more responsive. I mean, when I was in opposition, it was easy just to oppose everything the government did because there weren't consequences to that. Today, we have to try to develop a consensus. It's not going to happen on every bill or every motion, but what I think is going to be better about this kind of Parliament, this minority Parliament—if there are good things about minority Parliaments—is you try to develop that consensus and you recognize, in government, that not all the good ideas reside on the government side.

I've even got a couple of things I've said to the opposition members. My critic, for instance—we've got a bill we'd like to present sometime in the session on the Great Lakes and the protection of the Great Lakes. So I phoned both the opposition critics and said, "Do you have any good ideas on this that we should include in it?" I think that kind of across-the-aisle opportunity should be followed as often as possible, because there are some good ideas from members of this House and I'd like to see us be able to work together.

There are still going to be partisan clashes. That's part of the place; we understand that. But I think there's a good opportunity to make the House work, and I know that Mr. Yakabuski is the one who will lead that particular charge.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** He's always been a voice of moderation.

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Always a voice of moderation. I like hearing that.

So whether it's a government bill or private members' legislation, or perhaps an idea to study a public policy item that is in dire need of review, we're going to have to work together to make this happen. That is why I think it was good advice that former Premier Bill Davis provided to Premier McGuinty back in the fall, when he suggested that we set up a parliamentary working group. I think it was a good move when Premier McGuinty moved ahead with that particular idea suggested by Premier Davis.

For those who don't know, every week when the House is sitting and every two weeks during the inter-session, four members of each party get around a table and talk about how we can work together in the best interests of Ontarians. As a member of that group, I can tell you that slowly but surely, we're finding some common ground. Sometimes the common ground is on minor items, such as ensuring the government provides more information and technical briefings to the opposition before legislation is introduced, but there are more significant items on the table as well. For example, we're currently

working to set up a process for the reconciliation of two anti-bullying bills before this House, one from the Liberal government and one from a Conservative member. I'm optimistic, and the fact that we are here today establishing committees gives us that much more reason to be optimistic.

I say in the period of time that I have remaining that I know many of the members of the House, except for the new ones; but the longer-serving members. This is my 35th year in the House now, and I have met a lot of people over the years. I think we can actually make this work, and I like the kind of dialogue we're going to see.

Listen, in question period, it's going to be the cut and thrust, the usual. There may even be the odd partisan speech. But I am confident that the opposition will have a better opportunity to hold the government accountable, and that's positive from a public policy point of view. But I'm also optimistic that the opposition is going to want to play a role in actually seeing legislation moulded and changed in the right way. I mean, if the government comes in with bills that are clearly going to be unacceptable to the opposition, I can tell you what my expectation would be.

However, one of the dangers in this situation is that we could get into gridlock. The government is the government. Whether people around the province like it or not, the government is the government, so we'll have to pursue things, particularly in the situation we find ourselves in today, where I think people are looking for somewhat urgent action. They know there are extremely important issues confronting the province and so they are going to be looking out there—I think the people who are watching today, the people we talk to on a daily basis—for that consensus that we don't see, frankly, south of the border.

I think it's absolutely appalling, watching particularly the Congress of the United States at the present time and the hyperpartisanship that's taking place there. I don't think people want to see that duplication here and I don't think it's necessarily going to have to happen.

I know it's a different Parliament. People have pointed to the Davis government of 1977 to 1981, and I remember that very well. It worked exceedingly well, again, because the government was responsive and the opposition responsible. My assessment is that there was a much less partisan House. The ideological division was not nearly as great in those days as it is today. Many of the people who sat in that House could have sat in any one of the three parties at that particular time, and there was much collegiality that took place. Perhaps because of the days of the sitting of the House or whatever circumstances, there was much collegiality that took place. That is not the situation today.

So I don't think we can say that we can absolutely duplicate what happened from 1977 to 1981. There were different personalities, different ideological bents.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** You were younger then.

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** I was here with Yakabuski's father at that time, Mr. Yakabuski's father, who was a much more agreeable person, in many ways, to those

things happening. I was actually here with Norm Miller's father as well, and David Caplan's mother. There are a lot of people I was here with whose sons and daughters are here today.

But I'm looking forward to it. You know, a lot of people say, "Well, aren't you grinding your teeth at the fact that the opposition has more people than the government?" And I say, "I'm not grinding my teeth over that, because I know the personalities and I'm confident that we can make this Legislature work."

Listen, if I talk to the public, that's exactly what they want to see, and knowing the personalities in this House, I'm very confident that this committee structure will work in such a way as it will benefit the people of this province.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Simcoe-Grey.

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** The Progressive Conservative Party caucus, under the leadership of Tim Hudak, is also committed to making this Legislature work. That is why the Progressive Conservatives worked tirelessly alongside the NDP and with the government to form a new set of committee structures. For the first time in decades, the opposition will have a combined majority on legislative committees, which is indicative of the current makeup of this House.

Did we get everything we wanted in negotiations? No. Did the NDP and the government get everything they wanted? No. But through negotiation, compromise and hard work, our caucus is prepared to support this motion to form the standing committees of this legislative session. Ontarians can rest assured that Her Majesty's loyal opposition, under the leadership of Tim Hudak, will do its job to hold this government accountable in committees, improve government and private members' legislation in committee, and work hard to study and change the standing orders of this House to ensure that it works better for the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my House leader colleagues from the government side and the third party, and all the respective House officers and staff who helped to make this motion come to fruition. Thank you very much.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Timmins-James Bay.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I asked that this particular motion be tabled in this manner, rather than doing unanimous consent, for a couple of reasons. One was, I thought it was important that we actually are very clear about the motion, when it comes to the table, that we're dealing with the motion we actually negotiated. But the bigger issue is that I thought it was important to put on the record how we got here, and I think that's fairly important.

0920

First of all, let's recognize what happened. There was an election on October 6, and the result of that election brought a minority Parliament for the first time since 1985. There are only two members in this assembly who

sat in minority Parliaments: Mr. Bradley is one and Mr. Kwinter is the other. This is new territory for many of us—the majority of us—who, like myself, have been here for 22 years but never sat in a minority Parliament. I think everybody has to try to find a way to adjust.

What was clear in my mind was that when the government, after October 7, was out speaking to the media in regards to where they were going, it was clear that they were trying to copy the Harper minority style to the Ontario Legislature. The comment that I made to many of those in the media of the day who asked me is that you can't compare the federal House to the provincial Legislature. They are two different beasts, as you might say. The federal House, at the time, had more than three parties. At one time, they had as many as five parties, but they had three opposition parties to a government. You're talking about a Legislature that is three times the size of this one when it comes to membership, and a committee structure—this is the point—that is very, very different to the committee structure that we have here in Ontario.

What a lot of people didn't recognize is that the committee structure federally essentially is controlled, even in a minority, to a certain extent by the government because of the way the rules are written. But in Ontario, our legislative committees are structured in a very different way because we are trying to find that congeniality, to a certain extent, so that members can do their jobs on committee.

So the government started out by saying, "Well, you know what? We're going to model ourselves on Stephen Harper, and we're going to act as a major minority," if you remember that whole discussion. Myself and my colleague Jim Wilson had some exception to that because we said, "Listen, this is a minority Parliament. We need to be able to find a different way of moving forward." And the point that I made as House leader—and I'm not going to speak for the Conservatives because it's up to Mr. Wilson to say this part—is that I believe that what would work in this place is trying to find compromise. I went into those negotiations at the beginning, as the House leader for Andrea Horwath and the New Democratic Party, with a pretty firm position: that we copy what Bill Davis had essentially done. Bill Davis, in a minority of 1975 and 1977, had a model that said, "When we strike our committees, it will be committee membership plus one in order to replace the Chairs," so that there is never a tie when it comes to a vote on committee.

That was the compromise that quite frankly was gotten between the Conservatives, at the time of Mr. Davis, and New Democrats and Liberals, who were in opposition, because they recognized that having tied committees would offer a certain difficulty for the government, especially when it came to trying to amend bills, if there should be a tie on committee.

So we took a position that we thought was well thought through. It was based on the experience of Ontario and on the reality of the rules of the House. The government took a completely different view of just doing what it is that they would want to do as far as

striking committees just under the way that the standing orders called, for now, but to use those standing orders in such a way that would give them a slight advantage by tying up those committees.

So we went through an entire process. I always remember probably one of the most gruelling and most frustrating processes that I've seen for House leaders in a long time: trying to get the government to say, "Listen, there is a minority Parliament in this Legislature and we're going to have to compromise if we're going to move forward."

The government—I give them some credit—back in December, did show some movement as far as compromising. They put an offer on the table, and I'm not going to get into the details; it's too long. But they put an offer on the table. I remember sitting at the meeting with my colleague Madam DiNovo as the whip. We had our deputies there, France Gélinas, and we had Cindy Forster with us and our staff. I remember sitting there and listening to the compromise. I said, "Well, you know what? The government has moved, and it's incumbent upon us, the opposition, to take that offer seriously." At that time, I said, "I'm not saying we're going to say yes at this point, but this is movement. Let's see if we can work our way forward."

I got on the phone and talked to our people within the caucus. We figured it was a good compromise because we recognized that, at the end of the day, that's what it was going to take to get an agreement. I called the government House leader and said, "Okay, we're in. That's fine. If we do it the way that you suggest, we'll be fine." Much to our surprise, the government withdrew its offer, at which point I'm sort of standing there scratching my head, along with my colleagues, saying, "Hang on a second. What's going on here? Was the government only testing us, thinking that if we were to say no then all of a sudden they'd make us look unreasonable? Was it a game that they were playing?"

I have to think that's a little bit of what was going on, and I think that was unfortunate, because the government had to get into this process somewhat to recognize that there is the reality of October 6 and there is a minority Parliament. The opposition does control the majority of the House when it comes to what the votes in this House will be. We'll essentially have a fairly significant role when it comes to what happens in committee.

So we went through this dance of the seven veils, as I would call it, where we went to I don't know how many meetings after that December meeting and couldn't come to any kind of movement. I always remember, we'd go to these meetings, we would meet for an hour, nothing much would come of them, and we'd all be repeating our positions, until eventually I think the government understood. I think at one point the government started to say, "Well, we need to find some way forward," so they compromised on their original compromise and said, "Well, what about you do this?" at which point the opposition, Mr. Wilson and I, said, "Well, here are a couple of other

conditions that we want to put in," and I just want to speak to those very quickly.

One is that we time-limit this motion. This is not new to the Legislature. We have sessional motions that we've done before, but it's not normally the way things are done. My thinking at the time, and I want to put it on the record today, is that time-limiting the motion so that the government has to come back and create committees all over again in September puts the government on notice that they better be having good behaviour. They'd better not try to use committees in the way that I think they initially anticipated doing them, because in the end, it'll be more difficult for them once we get to September.

So I think what this does is it forces all of us in order to try to make this work—the opposition and the government—because at the end of the day, we need to respect what happened on October 6. The people of Ontario have spoken. People may like it or people may dislike it, depending what side of the House that they're on, but at the end of the day, they're the boss and we're their servants. We are here to do their work. Andrea Horwath has said that right from the beginning: The reason that we're all here now is to do what's right by the people of Ontario.

I hope in striking the committees in the way that we have, where the government is somewhat limited to what it can do when it sends bills to committees—probably not as much as Mr. Wilson would have liked to have limited you, but we see that as a compromise. We have to move; you have to move: That's what this was all about. We have struck a committee in order to take a look at the issue of how we approach changing the rules in this Legislature so that we truly can give the members the kind of ability that they need, by way of the rules, so that this place can work better.

One of the things that we hear a lot by all sides of the House, because we've all been government or opposition at one time or another in the last 20 years, is that members, including government members, are frustrated by the amount of control that the Premier's office has on members when it comes to what happens in this House and what happens on committee. It was true for Bob Rae; it was true for Mike Harris and Mr. Eves; and it certainly is true for Mr. Dalton McGuinty.

I think if we're able to go in and we're able to look at the rules of the Legislative Assembly, this House, understanding that, at the end, the government is the government and they must have their way in the sense of being able to do what their responsibility is as a government—but at the same time, members have to have the ability to do their jobs and to hold the government accountable in a way that makes some sense. We can maybe move those rules to a place that brings us back to how this Legislature used to work some 20 years ago, where there was much more congeniality across the aisle, where members were able to work on issues to the benefit of Ontarians and not just necessarily have to defend the government line or defend the opposition line. So I look forward to

what may happen on committee as a result of changing the standing orders.

The last point I would say is that for the government and the opposition, I think it was our sort of first, how would you say—it was the first test of this Parliament in the sense of, how are we able to move forward in a way that makes some sense? And I want to say to the government across the way, congratulations; you compromised. Congratulations to us; we compromised. Together, we were able to find something that nobody is totally happy with. I'm sure the government would have liked something different, and I'm sure the opposition wanted something different, but that's what compromise is all about. When you walk away from the table and nobody is truly excited, you know that maybe you've done something right.

So I look forward to what will happen on committee because, in the end, that's where the compromises will be made, and I look forward to the work that we'll be doing on committee this spring.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

Mr. Bradley has moved government notice of motion number 17. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*Motion agreed to.*

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### FAMILY CAREGIVER LEAVE ACT (EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS AMENDMENT), 2012

### LOI DE 2012 SUR LE CONGÉ FAMILIAL POUR LES AIDANTS NATURELS (MODIFICATION DES NORMES D'EMPLOI)

Mrs. Jeffrey moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 30, An Act to amend the Employment Standards Act, 2000 in respect of family caregiver leave / Projet de loi 30, Loi modifiant la Loi de 2000 sur les normes d'emploi en ce qui concerne le congé familial pour les aidants naturels.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Mrs. Jeffrey has moved second reading of Bill 30.

0930

**Hon. Linda Jeffrey:** Mr. Speaker, may I say how well you look in that chair? It's nice to see you there.

Mr. Speaker, it is again a pleasure to rise for the second reading of the Family Caregiver Leave Act (Employment Standards Amendment), 2011. I will be sharing my time with my parliamentary assistant, the member from York South–Weston.

Before I begin, I want to take a moment to welcome Scott Allinson. He's the vice-president of public affairs for the Human Resources Professionals Association. Thank you for being here.

This morning, I'm going to be speaking about proposed legislation which speaks to the heart of what government should do. The Family Caregiver Leave Act, if passed, would provide up to eight weeks of unpaid, job-protected leave so that employees can care for loved ones who are seriously injured or ill. The hard-working people of our province and those that depend on them deserve no less.

Every member of this House and all those who are listening or watching these proceedings share a common life experience: We are all either sons or daughters; we have grandparents; we may have children and spouses. In short, we're part of a family, and when somebody in our family becomes seriously ill or injured we want to be there because we need to be and because we care. When someone we love faces such a crisis, time stands still and nothing else matters—certainly not that email or project or that deadline we thought needed our full attention—because at such times our hearts and our minds are elsewhere. We're distracted because we want and we need to be with our loved one who is suffering.

This bill, if passed, would give working Ontarians the right to take care of their loved ones during those very difficult times without having to worry about losing their job. This legislation, if passed, would protect both full- and part-time employees, and even those on contract, and it would protect our families. We have asked the federal government to better support these families by allowing qualified employees to draw employment insurance while on this proposed leave, just as they do under the family medical leave legislation. We want to encourage our federal government to enter into a partnership with us in Ontario so that caregivers would also have the income security they deserve.

This legislation, if passed, would give the province's working people time—time to be with their hospitalized child and time to care for their elderly parents; time to be with their spouse who has had a stroke or a heart attack. Whether you're an employer or employee, emergencies arise that you cannot predict, and sooner or later we all face situations where our loved ones need our care.

There's an obvious need for this legislation that is all too familiar to anyone who has ever faced the challenge of juggling work commitments with the need to be present for a family member who is seriously ill or injured. I've personally known this to be true from my own experience. After my grandfather passed, my grandmother tried to manage by herself, and for a while, she seemed to be able to be coping. She lived in a small, rural village in England, the type of community where neighbours would pop in every now and then to see how my grandmother was doing. But gradually she started having falls, and my mother realized on one of her visits that my grandmother was in need of immediate assistance in order to be able to stay in her own home and avoid serious injury.

My mother was constrained by time and distance. She had only a two-week vacation from work in Canada to navigate a system in England that was unfamiliar, so she had to get an assessment, set up home care and ensure

that someone was able to check on my grandmother every day.

The hardest thing, my mother told me, was that she felt that the clock was ticking. My mother felt rushed in navigating and setting up a support system that was necessary for my grandmother, and making such drastic changes in my grandmother's life so quickly was not easy. My poor mother felt guilty about rushing through the process, but she had no choice: She had a job in Canada that she had to get back to.

That was more than 10 years ago, and really, the world hasn't changed much. We now have what is commonly known as the sandwich generation: busy parents who are often both at work and are trying to care for younger children. At the same time, they're facing the additional challenge of caring for aging parents, one or another, when they're seriously ill or an injury strikes. It's then that we realize how much we need and rely on the social safety net that government can provide; it's then that we realize how important, how critical it is to have our jobs protected when serious injury or illness occurs to the loved ones who need us most.

In my case, my grandmother was proud. She didn't want to admit that she needed help. It's understandable: Our parents have traditionally been the ones looking after us, and it can be a difficult transformation switching roles and admitting that you need help. Sometimes our parents are legitimately worried that they're taking us away from our jobs. I know this to be true from my own experience with my parents. They don't want to ask for my time and help, because they know I'm busy as the Minister of Labour. But I reassure them and let them know that I'm also the minister responsible for seniors, so helping them is actually part of my job.

For the family, for the parents of working Ontarians, this reluctance to reach out and ask for help can come from the knowledge that their child or their spouse does not currently have the job protection that they need. They may fear that a request for help might leave their loved one vulnerable or even unemployed. These fears are not unfounded, and that's why we're proposing this bill. But there are also other pressing reasons. Because, as I stated earlier, I am also the minister responsible for seniors, I'd like to speak about some of those who need care from their working adult children.

We all know that we have an aging population that is growing. We're going to have 43% more seniors a decade from now and twice as many 20 years from now, and that's a good thing. I'm sure there are many in the House who hope to be among that important cohort. Of course, as people age they need more care, and there are times of serious illness or injury when that need is critical and time sensitive. Our seniors, our aging parents, understandably want to be home as long as possible. It is care by family members that helps ensure that they can indeed stay at home, where they are most comfortable; at home, where there's less expense for our health care system.

Our government, through my cabinet colleague Minister Deb Matthews, has launched a care strategy to help

seniors stay healthy and provide better-quality care in the home, where they want to be. Our proposed family caregiver leave recognizes the vital role that family members play in health care. But to provide that care and to fulfill that role, working Ontarians need to know that their jobs will be there when they look after their loved ones.

On the day that this legislation was introduced, I made an announcement at Princess Margaret Hospital. At that event, a young woman by the name of Marcella Robless came forward. She came forward to give a very personal and touching account, and I'd like to read the remarks she made that day at Princess Margaret Hospital. She said:

"I took care of my mom for about three years. I am the sole caregiver for her. I've been in Canada now for about 28 years. The only family that I have now is my brother who is in Montreal and my mother who lives with me. We're not fortunate to have a lot of relatives [here] so all of the pressure and her care is on me. Two years of the three that I've been taking care of my mother I was in a full-time job. I don't know how I did it, but I managed to do both things.

"Those very same two years were the worst years for my mother. She was on radiation, chemotherapy, surgery. But what I have to say is that caregiving is not just bringing them to the appointments or bringing them to CT scans or MRIs—being a caregiver is also being there in the middle of the night, being there all the time. We don't have a break, you can't tell a disease...., 'Okay, I need a few days off and then I'll be back and take care of you.' So I really hope that you will support this bill.

"As caregivers we are not invincible, and we need support. I definitely need to feel, if I get a full-time job and my mother winds up being eligible for surgery, I can be there for her and not worry about it. Right now I'm in a part-time job, and this is something I have to think about every day."

That was Marcella's true and touching account, which resonates with many of us who have aging parents or other seriously ill or injured loved ones, at the same time trying to juggle work responsibilities. Marcella's words put a human face on the need for this bill.

I was also touched by the personal account given by the member from Essex in response to the introduction of this bill. The member told this House about the catastrophic injury his brother suffered, leaving him in urgent need of care. I thank the member for his thoughtful and candid comments when the bill was introduced.

Our heart goes out to all those who struggle through difficult and challenging situations in the hopes of caring for their loved ones. Again, I know from my own experience that when a crisis happens, we need time to care for our loved ones. When my grandmother was in the midst of her health care crisis, it took time to assess her needs, arrange for home care, get her a walker and outfit her home with grab bars. I remember how frustrated my mother was with a health care system that didn't seem to react quickly enough when her mother was struggling.

Looking back, my mother actually achieved a lot and did a remarkable job in a very short period of time.

#### 0940

A health care crisis can be very stressful and very difficult for working Ontarians when they don't have the security of knowing that their employment, their means of providing for themselves and their family, is protected and secure. At times like this, the last thing we need to worry about is being out of work. We shouldn't have to worry about being unemployed on top of coping with the medical crisis of a loved one that we're trying to deal with. When the chips are down, you want to know that someone is in your corner, and that's what this proposed legislation is all about.

If passed, our bill would assist people and the economy in other ways. It would help protect and retain skilled workers who might otherwise have to leave their employment or who might lose it. Keeping skilled labour is good for employers, employees and the Ontario economy alike. Skilled labour is what keeps our province competitive, and that's important in these challenging times. Job-protected leave during periods of crisis is one thing we can do to help keep skilled labour on the job.

Mr. Speaker, this proposed legislation would provide reasonable protection for both employers and employees alike. This unpaid leave would require that a physician issue a medical certificate. And while we've asked our federal counterparts to provide employment insurance to those who would be eligible for the leave, it would currently be unpaid.

In the time since this legislation was first introduced, my ministry staff have had the opportunity to sit down with a variety of business stakeholders to get their feedback on the proposed leave. A few weeks ago, in Toronto, I was asked to speak at the Human Resources Professionals Association, and I spoke about the family caregiver leave. Later, they shared with me a recent survey that they had sent out to their membership. Of the over 600 people who responded, 95.6% supported the idea of family caregiver leave. The Human Resources Professionals Association told us that this leave is an excellent retention initiative. They pointed out that it's costly to recruit, select and train new employees. It's better to allow for family caregiver leave rather than the alternative of having to go through the process of hiring a new employee. This legislation would benefit all workplace parties. Whether they're employers or workers, we're all part of a family, and we understand what families go through in times of serious illness or injury.

This bill is for the young family or single parent needing to care for a child in hospital diagnosed with a serious medical condition. It's for the wife helping her husband through a difficult period of chemotherapy or radiation. It's for someone caring for that elderly parent who has suffered a broken hip. This proposed legislation, Mr. Speaker, is our way of saying to the people of this province that we will be there to help protect you as you protect your loved ones.

That same spirit of compassion that inspired this bill also led to our government introducing family leave back in 2004. The current family medical leave legislation provides job-protected leave for employees when a family member is facing a terminal condition. Our proposed family caregiver leave would complement this legislation and would apply in cases of serious illness or injury, even when there's no significant risk of imminent death. The proposed family caregiver leave would be in addition to the family medical leave. That means that if you're caring for a loved one under the proposed family caregiver leave and their condition becomes terminal, you would also be entitled to the family medical leave.

Speaker, this proposed legislation would, if passed, assist Ontarians who are most vulnerable, and that's because the burden of caregiving usually lies most heavily on those without the financial resources to provide care. Our bill would assist the poor. It would help the immigrant family new to Canada, already struggling with adapting to a new home. It would assist single parents. And it would assist women, to whom we all know a disproportionate share of the responsibility of caring for family members still falls.

With this proposed legislation, we'll be able to tell working Ontarians, "Go and take care of your loved one's needs, and you can make them a priority. Go and be reassured that your job will be there when you return." It says, "We understand why you care and why you need to be there."

Speaker, this bill is simply the right thing to do for the working people of our province and for those they love.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate? Questions and comments?

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** I'd like to talk a little bit about this caregiver leave. I think it's an interesting proposal. You know, we do have some other leave provisions under the Employment Standards Act.

Many people find themselves in difficulty when they have family members who have a serious illness or injury. However, I think there is a need to ensure that we have appropriate health care in place as well in this province. We have 10,000 people waiting on a home care list who need home care in the province. There is a need for more personal support work for seniors, more health care aides hired in the home care setting to provide some of this.

The problem I see right off the top with the bill is the fact that there are many people working in minimum wage jobs here in the province of Ontario, particularly over the last few years, as we've lost thousands of jobs, who couldn't afford to take advantage of this initiative. When you're making 10 bucks an hour at Tim Hortons, you can't take a day off to look after your family member if you're a single support parent. So I think there needs to be something built into this proposal that would provide people in those situations the opportunity to get some income replacement.

The theory is good because the existing legislation really only applies to end-of-life types of situations, but I

don't think that it necessarily goes far enough at this point.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Questions and comments?

Minister, you have two minutes to respond.

**Hon. Linda Jeffrey:** I just want to thank the member from Welland for her comments. I appreciate that she's trying to find solutions on this bill.

I think at the end of the day we all recognize that there are many families across this province who, through no fault of their own, struggle to try and juggle a family member who's injured or ill, or a serious crisis happens in your family and you need time away. We believe this piece of legislation will give that comfort to an employer and employee that they have certainty about the job being protected.

We think it's important to have those conversations. Obviously we've been out talking to stakeholders, and I appreciate the advice given on this issue. Certainly we know that caregiving usually often falls disproportionately to women because they're often the caregivers in the family. The woman I spoke about at Princess Margaret who had to juggle her job and her mother's situation ended up having to leave her job. I know that caused her economic hardship.

We believe this piece of legislation will help assist those individuals. We want to make sure that Ontarians know that we have their back, that we're going to protect them and that we're proposing a piece of legislation that will help ensure that they know that when they leave to take care of someone they love, they don't have to worry that their job isn't going to be there when they get back. We are going to put something in place that will reassure them that their job will be there, and that certainty, I think, helps all employers.

**0950**

We all know that skilled employees are important to the economy of Ontario, and we want to make sure that we provide certainty to the employer and to the employee that, should something catastrophic happen in your family, this piece of legislation would provide them that comfort, knowing that they can't be thrown out, that they can come back. When everything is restored in their family, they can come back to a workplace that they have a valuable contribution to provide.

I hope to listen to any other comments the other side has. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make comments or to address the Family Caregiver Leave Act. I find little merit in that act, and I will not be supporting it. That is the end of my comments to that.

However, I would like to say thank you to the House leaders of the government and to the third party for accommodating me with time to make my maiden speech, which I would like to do at this point in time. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to address this esteemed House. This will be my maiden speech.

It is a great honour and a privilege to sit here in the Ontario Legislative Assembly as the elected representative for the riding of Carleton–Mississippi Mills. Carleton–Mississippi Mills is a wonderful mix of rural and urban, of old and new. The population is 25% rural and 75% urban. The city of Kanata is the biggest urban area in the riding and is growing rapidly. There has been a population increase of 16,000 people in the last five years. Many of the people are new Canadians in our riding, and the biggest share of that population is Chinese people.

There is a broad spectrum of industries in Carleton–Mississippi Mills, ranging from farms in the rural area that were established in the early 1800s, to construction companies, to the high-tech industry.

Kanata is the high-tech centre for Canada. It is a proud testimonial to the resiliency of the high-tech industry that they have been able to rebound after the failure of Nortel 10 years ago. They have created enough new jobs to replace all the jobs that were lost during the high-tech meltdown, only now, there are twice as many companies as there were back then. New, smaller companies created these jobs. This is innovation at its best.

Many of the residents in the riding are also employed by the federal government, which is a very large employer that adds great long-term stability to our local economy.

Carleton–Mississippi Mills is in the Ottawa Valley, with the Ottawa River as its northern boundary. As one stands on the shore of the Ottawa River, gazing across the majestic mile-wide body of water at the beautiful Gatineau Hills in Quebec, you can imagine the early explorer Samuel de Champlain canoeing up the river 400 years ago, as he headed west.

A few words about my family and our history and experience in the riding. My wife, Janet, who is here in the gallery today, and I have been married for 32 years, and we have three daughters: Jessica, Rachel and Alexis. Janet and all three girls are registered nurses, and I'm very proud of them. Janet and Alexis—and Alexis is here, sitting beside my wife—work at the Queensway Carleton Hospital in Ottawa. Rachel is working at a hospital in San Diego, and Jessica works at a hospital in Calgary.

I graduated from Queen's University with a degree in civil engineering. I worked in engineering and construction in Vancouver for three years and Calgary for seven years. I experienced the economic downturn of the oil industry in 1981. I lost my job in 1982. We had two babies and a mortgage, nobody was hiring, and house prices were falling fast. It was a terrible time for my family. I learned how devastating bad times can be.

We came back to the family farm at MacLaren's Landing in 1982 and have been proud to be farming ever since. I lived and worked and raised my family in Carleton county, as did my father and his father before him and his father before him. Our farm was a crown grant to our family in 1826.

In our house, it was always understood that with the enjoyment and benefits of a healthy community comes the obligation to contribute to the community. For several generations, my family has been actively involved in politics at the municipal and provincial levels.

When I was a boy, I can remember my father talking to Erskine Johnston, who was the MPP for the riding at the time. My father was one of Erskine Johnston's strongest grassroots supporters and communication links to the local community. Erskine was a great MPP. He was accessible to his constituents and helped his constituents. He was well thought of and respected in his community. He was an excellent role model.

Over the past 30 years, I have had leadership roles in several community organizations. Most recently, I was president of the Ontario Landowners Association. Through these organizations, I have had experience dealing with bureaucrats and politicians from all three levels of government. I have travelled Ontario from Glengarry to Niagara, to Essex, to Manitoulin, to Sudbury, to Toronto and places in between to answer calls for help, calls for help from people who have government knocking on their door.

We have become an over-regulated society with regulations that are unnecessary or wrongful. This tells us what we already know: that the fight for freedom, justice and democracy will never end; that if we relaxed our democratic guard, our freedoms would be taken away from us by those who think we should be controlled.

We all know government has become too big, too expensive and too controlling. It is time to take control of the business of government. We must reduce our spending and our debt. We must eliminate the unnecessary regulations that interfere with the abilities of people, businesses and communities to thrive. People must be free to be creative and innovative. I believe in small government, low taxes and minimal regulation. I believe that government should exist to serve people, not rule over them. I believe it is the basic nature of men and women to do good, and men and women should be free to do what they want so long as they do not hurt anyone or the environment. Ontario must once again become a welcome place to live and work and play.

We must remember that the foundation of democracy is the Magna Carta of the year 1215. That wonderful document of 800 years ago defined that the common man had rights: the right to life, liberty and property. It defined that government should serve people, that government was nothing but the instrument of the common man. The intention of the Magna Carta was clearly stated in William Pitt's oft-cited address to Parliament in 1763: "The poorest man may in his cottage do defiance to all the forces of the crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storm may enter; the rain may enter, but the King of England cannot enter. All his forces may not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement!"

But somewhere along the line, government seems to have forgotten that freedom and democracy are the guar-

anteed right of the common man. This right is enshrined in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This guaranteed right is centuries old, the product of hard-won struggles and well-established jurisprudence. We have become an over-regulated, over-governed society. There are 500,000 regulations in Ontario. Government has become too big, has gone too far, and is intruding into people's lives and businesses in an unwanted and wrongful way. Government has taken freedoms away from the common man. This is a problem.

What do we do? As lawmakers, we must do something. We must remember that we are nothing but the servant of the common man.

**1000**

I would like to talk to you about some of my experiences with the Ontario Landowners Association, to tell some stories of wrongful actions by government.

Mike Westley, who is in our members' gallery here, and 60 of his neighbours in rural Ottawa fought the city of Ottawa, the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority for six years to prevent their properties from being wrongfully designated as provincially significant wetlands. The problem developed over many years, as all three agencies issued permits for new development of quarries, highways, housing subdivisions and streets that caused more and new runoff into the creek that flowed through Mike's and his neighbours' properties. The result was that the increased water flow flooded their properties.

Then, the three agencies of government said their properties were a wetland and they intended to designate their lands as provincially significant wetlands. The Drainage Act states that a neighbour cannot increase or decrease the amount of water in a watershed that would harm a downstream neighbour. This position has been upheld in court, which is the basis of common law. Mike and his neighbours hired a large backhoe and they dug out the creek to increase the capacity of the creek. The drainage problem has been resolved.

Wendell Palmer, who is also here in our members' gallery, of the Niagara area had an old and very large, exotic breed of pig. The pig waddled when it walked and had a slight limp. Wendell's veterinarian said the pig was healthy, just old. An OSPCA inspector came to Wendell's farm and said the pig was in distress and must be destroyed immediately. Over Wendell's protests, she shot the pig 17 times in the head, but the pig was still alive. She went back to her office for a bigger gun. Wendell was left to the task of slitting the pig's throat to end its suffering. Wendell was charged with animal abuse.

Steve Straub, a farm labourer of the St. Thomas area, owned and cared for a variety of unusual birds and animals on his father's five-acre home and property. The OSPCA handcuffed Steve and threw him into the back of the police cruiser as they seized his birds and animals. He pleaded guilty to the terrible crime of having a budgie birdcage with a dirty floor. The OSPCA order was written in the names of Steve and his father, John, because his father owned the land and the house, the only sig-

nificant asset the family had. The OSPCA then sent invoices for the care and housing of Steve's birds and animals to Steve and John Straub jointly in the amount of \$168,000. The OSPCA took Steve and John to civil court to collect the bill. The judge threw out all the invoices, except for \$5,000.

Ed Embury, a farmer near Napanee, has been hounded by the Kingston Ministry of the Environment for seven years over a minor manure spill on to a neighbour's farm field. The MOE persisted over the years with inspections and charges and took Ed to court many times. Recently, the justice of the peace threw out all of the charges, saying they were frivolous.

In November 2009, Major Mark Tijssen—and Mark's mother, Linda, is here in the gallery with us today—was charged under four different sections of the Food Safety and Quality Act because he bought a pig from a local farmer and slaughtered it to feed his family. A Ministry of Natural Resources enforcement officer sat in a neighbour's tree stand for five days watching Mark and his children in their home with night-vision goggles. The MNR then raided Mark's home, with six squad cars with lights flashing.

The maximum fine was \$100,000, but Mark was told that the fine would be reduced to \$1,000 if he pleaded guilty. But Mark said he didn't do anything wrong and decided to fight the charges in court. Major Tijssen acted as his own attorney, arguing that he had a constitutional right to choose the food he wants to eat. On December 6, 2011, the MNR delivered a letter to Major Tijssen, stating that they intended to drop all charges after two long years of court appearances.

Bob Mackie of Beamsville, who is in the gallery with us today, set up a small archery training business on his nine-acre rural property. About seven years ago, the Niagara Escarpment Commission, which is the local planning authority, ordered Bob to stop his archery business because his land had an agricultural use designation in their official plan and archery was not mentioned as a permitted use on agricultural land. The official plan doesn't mention archery as a prohibited activity; it just doesn't mention it at all.

This is contrary to common law which is practised in Ontario, which states that a man can do whatever he wants unless it is prohibited by law or regulation. Bob continues his seven-year fight for his rights in court.

George Eng and his neighbours own land at Mount Albert; they excavate and sell peat on their land. That is their business, their livelihood, and they have been doing it for over 40 years. Four years ago, the Lake Simcoe conservation authority designated their properties as provincially significant wetlands and told George and his neighbours they were breaking the law by excavating peat. They were told to stop doing business. George and a few neighbours have been charged and are in court fighting for their rights and their livelihoods using their crown land patent grant as their property rights defence.

These are examples of the negative effects that some of the 500,000 regulations that we have in Ontario are

having on people's freedoms and rights. We need to make changes that will restore these lost liberties and property rights. Life, liberty and private property ownership are the foundation of any successful democracy. The law, which is the collective will of individuals, is intended to provide justice, to protect liberty and property. If a man takes another man's property without his permission, it is illegal theft, or plundering. If government uses a law to take a man's property without his permission, it is legal plundering, but it is still plundering and that is wrong. Such a wrongful law must be struck down.

Thank you. I will be sharing my time with the member for Chatham-Kent-Essex.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member for Chatham-Kent-Essex.

**Mr. Rick Nicholls:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the minister for her presentation. I listened intently. As a member of the PC caucus, we are extremely compassionate to the needs of Ontarians.

We all know that there have always been seen and unseen benefits and consequences to each and every bill that is passed by the Legislature. The seen benefits in each piece of legislation are held up as triumphs; the seen benefits are what families read about in the next morning's newspaper. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we on the opposition side of the Legislature believe that the unseen consequences of this particular bill deserve close and careful scrutiny. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the ministry has not done its due diligence in investigating and recognizing the unseen consequences of this bill.

Following ministry briefings and discussions with my colleagues, I'm left with the distinct impression that the purpose of this bill is not to correct or solve a defect within the legislation it seeks to amend, nor to address a looming and credible threat to the well-being of Ontario families. Frankly, it is my opinion that this bill, while bearing all the trappings of being well-intentioned and designed for the good of Ontario workers and families, is instead a document designed for political posturing on the part of the government. Allow me to explain how I and my colleagues have arrived at this conclusion.

According to ministry personnel, they have little or no empirical, statistical or anecdotal evidence that there are people being denied time off from their employment to provide care for their loved ones. Not only have there been no studies, there aren't even mechanisms in place to collect the kind of data that would give the members of this House—and the Ontario taxpayers who must pay for it—a clear idea of any real or imagined problem this bill claims to solve. Furthermore, this bill neither creates nor empowers the collection of such data. For all the information that has been provided to the members of the opposition, Mr. Speaker, this bill may as well have been created in a vacuum.

In short, we will never be able to ascertain with any degree of accuracy whether this legislation, should it be passed, provides the people of Ontario with any tangible benefits or, on the other side of the coin, addresses the consequences of not passing it.

1010

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I find it astounding for two reasons. First, nobody should know better than this government the perils of not doing your homework before introducing legislation. The headlong rush into the creation of this bill reminds us all of the lack of consultation with local communities and business owners that has given rise to unwanted industrial wind turbines across the province, including in my own riding of Chatham-Kent-Essex. You would think this government would have learned by now of the loss of trust in government that will undoubtedly result from not doing your homework.

And as deputy critic for labour, I find it astounding that this government would introduce a bill that not only fails to make a case for its own existence but approaches the suggestion that Ontario employers and job creators are somehow mistreating their own staff by denying them job-protected employment leave, a proposition that, as I've said, is completely unsubstantiated. Ontario's entrepreneurs and small business owners deserve better than to be viewed with suspicion, yet it is my fear that by allowing this bill to proceed in the manner it has, without backing up the ministry's claim, it is accomplishing exactly that negative effect. As I stated a few moments ago, it is our duty and the duty of every member of this House to fully investigate both the seen and unseen benefits and consequences to every piece of legislation brought forward for debate.

It is to the unseen consequences of this bill I would like to now turn, and one in particular that we ought to safeguard against. This bill has all the hallmarks of shifting the responsibility for family care from the individual onto the collective shoulders of the taxpayers. That is something that should be of concern to all Ontario families. As a husband, a father and a grandfather myself, Mr. Speaker, I tell you that a bill that alters this relationship must be examined very, very closely.

I've also had the great privilege, like many of my colleagues on this side of the House, to have been an employer in my lifetime. I draw from that valuable experience when considering any piece of legislation that seeks to affect the relationship between job creators and the Ontarians they employ. I can tell you, as an entrepreneur, that that relationship is based on the firm ground of mutual respect, mutual benefit and accommodating each other's priorities and individual needs.

As I mentioned a moment ago, it was clear to me that in developing this bill, the ministry had prepared little in the way of case studies citing a need for new legislation. Yet I believe we owe it to Ontario workers and families to base our debate proceedings on firm evidence drawn from real-world experiences of the folks who sent us here.

I took the liberty of researching this issue myself to see what business owners in my riding of Chatham-Kent-Essex would tell me about their approach to their employees' needs in the case of illness in the family. Some were unionized, while other smaller businesses were not. With unionized firms, I was told that situations

requiring time off to care for a loved one were covered through the collective agreement or through passed legislation. For the non-unionized businesses, it was a matter of using the strong relationship between employee and employer to find a unique solution without setting precedents.

I discovered that mutual understanding and respect, demonstrated on both sides, often resulted in the employee being given the needed time off to attend to their loved ones, a very compassionate gesture on the part of the employer. It is my firm belief that by replacing this relationship with a rigid and prescribed legal code, all the requirements for flexibility, mutual consideration and mutual respect will be removed from the relationship between the employer and employee. It will become just another area of life in Ontario in which this government seeks to have its say.

Next, from my discussions or those of my colleagues with the ministry, there is some desire to work with federal counterparts to recognize time off provided by this bill as an insurable benefit under the federal employment insurance program. Yet it is deeply troubling to me that this bill has reached second reading without an agreement of terms with the federal government. Frankly, there has been so little discussion with the federal government on this topic as to be negligible. What will the costs be? We don't know, and this ministry cannot tell us. What happens if the federal government does not accept the terms? We don't know, and this ministry cannot tell us. Where are the safeguards against abuse and fraud? We don't know, Ontario families don't know, and Ontario employers don't know, because this ministry cannot tell us. We ought to be cautious of this. We owe it to Ontario families and workers, who have seen the cost and size of government go up and up, to give this bill the close scrutiny that it clearly requires.

*Second reading debate deemed adjourned.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The clock is now at 10:15 and this House stands recessed until 10:30.

*The House recessed from 1015 to 1030.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Mrs. Christine Elliott:** I would like to ask all members to help me in welcoming Mr. Mike Glennie and family friend Mr. Mao, who are in the gallery today from the great riding of Whitby-Oshawa. They're here to observe page Grace Glennie in action today.

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** I would like members of the Legislature to join me in welcoming, in the members' east gallery, Rosemary and Robert Cooper, parents of page William Cooper from Canadian Martyrs school in St. Catharines, as well as William's cousin Candace Cooper. We welcome them to Queen's Park.

**Ms. Soo Wong:** Today I would like to welcome to the House Mr. Jeff Mole, a constituent of mine. Mr. Mole is the founder of the Trillium Energy Alliance, which seeks

to create a province-wide network of local energy generation co-operatives. Please join me in welcoming Mr. Mole to the House.

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** I would like to welcome guests here that have come to join us in the Legislature today: my wife, Janet MacLaren, on the left here, and my daughter Alexis MacLaren beside her, who are both registered nurses working in hospitals in Ontario, and I'm very proud of them; Yvette and Bob Mackie from Beamsville; Mike and Dawn Westley from Ottawa; and Linda Tijssen, mother of Mark Tijssen.

These people all came to hear my maiden speech a little earlier this morning, Mr. Speaker, and they are all members of—

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Brilliant.

**Interjection:** Great speech.

*Applause.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order.

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** It was a great encouragement for me to have them here as friends and family. I would like to say they are all proud members of the Ontario Landowners Association as well.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Renfrew heckles his own members.

Minister.

**Hon. Michael Gravelle:** I would like to introduce to the House my good friend from Thunder Bay, in north-western Ontario, and a very active northern Ontarian entrepreneur, Mr. Shane Diakunchak. Shane, thank you, and welcome.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** In the press gallery today, we have a new group of visiting journalism students from Sheridan College. Again, my preamble is that they're here at Queen's Park today to shadow and learn from Queen's Park reporters. Today we have Nasr Ahmed, Chelsea Andrade, Mary Katherine Bowyer, Meron Gaudet, Justin Goulet, Christopher Haley, David Larocque, Lily Martin, Geoff McGregor, Colin Meenagh, Priscilla Monachese, Channele Ouellet, Nathan Peters, Stephen Pike, Rosemond Quartey, Gurnek Nick Singh and Andrea Stathers. Welcome.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### PUBLIC SERVICES

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Don Drummond, your hand-picked adviser, said on page 9, in his message from the chair, that "each rejected recommendation must be replaced not by a vacuum, but by a better idea—one that delivers a similar fiscal benefit." The Ontario PCs agree with Mr. Drummond in that respect.

The Premier has already announced that he's taking \$1.5 billion off the table from Mr. Drummond's recommendations, to finance full-day kindergarten. I asked the Premier yesterday how he's going to make up that \$1.5

billion. He didn't answer me, Speaker, so I'll ask him again today. Premier, to make up that \$1.5 billion, are you contemplating further spending cuts or are you contemplating tax increases?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** I appreciate the question, once again, and my answer is the same. The answer will be contained in the budget itself. We will use this period of time, pre-budget, to hear from the Leader of the Opposition, the leader of the third party, a legislative committee, Ontarians generally. The finance minister will continue his pre-budget consultations, and I fully expect that all MPPs will, as part of their responsibilities, reach out to their own constituents.

Again, I say to my honourable colleague that if he has any particular pieces of advice with respect to which of these provisions he recommends that we adopt and which he recommends that we reject, we would of course be more than pleased to hear from him.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** As the Premier knows, we've gone farther than that. We've put on the table ideas to save \$2 billion—and a mandatory public sector wage freeze, by way of example. We've talked about arbitration reform. We've talked about competitive bidding across government. Hopefully, the Premier will in fact finally take up these ideas that he has rejected to date.

Premier, I think you're feeling the magnitude of the mess that you've dug us into. For over a year now, you've increased spending when you said you'd go the opposite way. The deficit is up, not down. All but two ministries are actually up in spending instead of going down, as you promised. And now you've taken \$1.5 billion off the table for full-day kindergarten.

The question I also had that you failed to answer, Premier, is, your education minister, in a February 21 article in the *Toronto Sun*, was also backing away from Mr. Drummond's recommendation on ending the hard cap on class size—another \$500-million hole you have to fill. I'll ask you, Premier: Will it be filled with tax hikes or spending reductions?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, I find it disappointing, frankly, that the leader of the official opposition's go-to place, when it comes to government cuts, is public education. We have a different value set in that regard. I think the single most important thing that we can do for our families is to invest in our children by giving them a great-quality education, and the single most important thing that we can do to grow our economy in a knowledge-based era of globalization is to invest in a skilled workforce. That speaks to the high value that we attach to publicly funded education in Ontario.

Again, I say I find it disappointing that the leader of the official opposition's go-to place for cuts is publicly funded education for all our children.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Speaker, the Premier knows full well these are recommendations by Mr. Don Drummond, your hand-picked adviser. For some time, Premier, you

basically described him as your white knight. He was going to save you from the \$30-billion hole. Now you're treating him like some distant relative you may see at the occasional family reunion.

Parsing through the Premier's speaking points is often challenging. Let me see if I understand his comments today. You seem to be signalling, Premier, that similarly, the hard cap on class size recommendation of Mr. Drummond—the \$500 million is now off the table, and you seem to be recommending that Mr. Drummond's target to reduce the number of non-classroom teaching staff by 70% is off the table. Premier, that's about an additional \$1.6 billion, and partnered with full-day kindergarten, \$2.5 billion.

So am I reading you correctly, Premier? Are those additional recommendations by Mr. Drummond now off the table?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, it's going to be a long time for my honourable colleague if all he does between now and budget day is ask me what's going to be in the budget. I'm not going to divulge that. It's a work in progress. It's something that we think is important to consult Ontarians on. We continue our deliberations, but we remain very much open to advice.

My concerns are the inconsistencies that are coming from the opposite bench. At first, the leader of the official opposition says we need to adopt the report in its entirety, that we should not cherry-pick. And now he's saying no, he's not prepared to adopt the LHIN recommendation; he's not prepared to adopt the recommendation that says we bargain firmly but fairly with Ontario doctors; he's not prepared to adopt the recommendation that says that we ought to put into question the \$345 million we invest in supporting the horse racing industry in Ontario. Again, a clear message would be very helpful.

1040

## PUBLIC SERVICES

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** You know, what's truly disappointing is the Premier's seeming lack of understanding of the depth of the problem he has dug us into. We are in a debt crisis in the province of Ontario. Premier, according to your own adviser, Mr. Drummond, we're on track to a \$30-billion deficit. You are on the verge of having Ontario triple its debt, to \$400 billion. This is very serious.

I know you're trying to stick to your talking points here, you're trying to avoid the tough questions, but you have made some commitments. You're going to add on an additional \$1.5 billion in full-day kindergarten. You now appear to be backing away from Mr. Drummond's recommendations on the cap on class size and the non-teaching personnel. That's about \$2.6 billion. If you want our advice, let me ask you again, are you asking us to find an additional \$2.6 billion in savings because those items are now off the table?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Again, I would say to my colleague that we look forward to answering all of his

questions and then probably a bit more through the budget.

I do want to quote a little bit from the Drummond report because I think it's always helpful. In particular, he said that "spending is neither out of control nor wildly excessive. Ontario runs one of the lowest-cost provincial governments in Canada relative to its GDP and has done so for decades." It also goes on to make some interesting findings. In relation to our GDP, total government spending in Ontario is the third-lowest in Canada, the tax burden is the second-lowest in Canada and per capita spending is the lowest in Canada.

So again, I say to my honourable colleague, yes, there is a real concern in front of us. It's important that we tackle the deficit. It's important to understand our fundamental underlying strengths as well.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Well, it seems like, sadly, the Premier is the only person in Ontario who thinks that spending is under control. In fact it's the opposite. I'd remind you, Premier, that you're spending \$1.8 million more every hour, 24 hours a day, than you take in in revenue; and since the Drummond report alone, you're over \$250 million further in the hole. All I see from the Premier is Liberal talking points and continuing dithering and delay.

We would have a very different approach. I said I would have reduced the size of my cabinet down to 16 members. I would have called the Drummond report immediately so we could have brought in a fall economic statement that actually would have reduced spending instead of your bills that are increasing spending. We would have brought in a public sector wage freeze and saved \$2 billion off the top.

Premier, since you seem to be dithering and delaying and taking things off the table on Drummond, will you at least accept our proposals to rein in spending, including a public sector wage freeze to save us \$2 billion off the top?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** I'll remind my honourable colleague that the Drummond commission in fact recommended against that very specifically. He called it—I'll use his word, Speaker—"dumb." That's a direct quote; it's in the document itself. So we're not going to go there for all the right reasons.

But I think there is an important and sharp contrast to be had between their values and our values. They support the \$345-million subsidy to the Ontario horse racing industry. We think we should consider redeploying that money so it supports our schools and our health care. That's a question of fundamental values. I think it's an important contrast between that side and this side, and I would dare to say that our values are in keeping with those shared by Ontarians.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Premier, frankly, here's the contrast: Instead of dithering and delaying, we would have acted immediately to rein in spending in the province of Ontario: a public sector wage freeze to save \$2 billion; an

end to your feed-in tariff program that is driving up hydro bills and impacting on the finances of the province as a whole.

Premier, you've gone even beyond cherry-picking; you're taking out entire bricks in the foundation that Mr. Drummond laid out for you. You're taking out the full-day kindergarten brick and now it sounds like you're taking out the bricks when it comes to class sizes and the 70% reduction in non-teaching personnel in education. That's about \$2.6 billion right there. Plus, you've brought in new spending initiatives totalling \$2.5 billion.

I know old habits are hard to break, Premier, but will you please tell us, are you going to make up that difference through tax hikes, or where will you find additional savings that pay for all your additional spending?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, again, we were very clear from the outset that the Drummond commission's responsibility, as we saw it, was to advise, and our responsibility in government is to decide. I would say to my honourable colleague that the responsibility of government is to bring judgment to bear on the advice that we receive, so there are some recommendations here that we are going to accept, others we will accept with modifications, others we will outright reject, and others we will send for further study. I've made that very clear in my meetings with Don Drummond himself.

My honourable colleague said that no judgment is required here, that there's no value set to be brought to bear on these recommendations. He says we should adopt these holus-bolus, notwithstanding the fact that we hear over and over from his caucus about different reservations they have with respect to different recommendations. I say again: They advise; we decide. We'll bring Ontario values to bear in our decision-making.

## TAXATION

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My question is for the Premier. Yesterday, the Conservatives tabled a motion calling on the government to maintain the Premier's scheduled corporate tax giveaways. My question is a pretty simple one, Speaker: Will the Premier side with struggling everyday families, or will he side with the Conservatives?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** I appreciate the question, Speaker, and—

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** We're always right. Side with us.

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** It's good to be wanted. What I must say and what I can say is that the responsibility that we share here in government, of course, is to listen to both sides and to draw what wisdom we might from those, and then to inform our decisions with, I think, a broad value base shared by Ontarians. I think that this is what they want at this point in time. They want us to tackle the deficit in earnest. They want us to do it in a way that ideally improves the quality of our schools and our health care system. They want a strong foundation for growth and they want us to create more jobs. That's the mindset and the value set that we'll bring to bear as we receive conflicting advice from my opposition parties.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Well, Speaker, I can certainly understand the Premier's dilemma. On the one hand, the Conservatives are endorsing the Premier's very plan; on the other hand, it's a reckless plan. It's a plan that has not helped create more jobs for people in this province and it is not a plan that's a priority for families.

Can New Democrats expect the Premier's support next week when this motion comes to a vote in the House? Can we expect the Liberals to be with us in voting against the Conservative motion?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** I understand my honourable colleague's devotion and perhaps even obsession with the tax issue. Taxes are always an important part of the balance that forms the foundation for growth and prosperity.

But again, I say to my honourable colleague, she says that we should freeze corporate taxes. That would save us \$800 million, but we have a \$16-billion deficit, so that constitutes a 5% solution. So I say to her again, what about the other 95%? I know where she stands on the first 5%. She has been very clear and very consistent, and I give her that. But what I ask her again is, what are her proposals with respect to the remaining 95% of the savings that we need to find?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Well, I'll remind the Premier that he shouldn't have gone down this misguided path in the first place and stuck with his guns. He used to believe that corporate tax reductions were not the way to go.

Nonetheless, families across this province are still reeling from the recession. London's unemployment rate is at 9%. Windsor's is at 11%. Sixteen thousand people are out of work in Oshawa. In Toronto, 275,000 Torontonians are looking for work. The answer isn't more tax giveaways to companies that pick up and head south. It's a job creation strategy that rewards companies that actually create jobs.

Speaker, will the Premier say today, once and for all, that he will not move ahead with the corporate tax cuts?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, again, we'll provide our answer in the budget. But what I can say to my honourable colleague is that right after question period, in fact, on this very day, we'll all have an opportunity to support what I believe to be a very important initiative that will create some 10,000 jobs per year, create \$800 million in economic activity every year and provide our parents and grandparents, aged Ontarians, up to \$1,500 every year in tax credits for renovations in their home. It's our healthy home renovation tax credit, and I encourage my honourable colleague to support that very initiative momentarily, right after question period.

1050

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My next question is to the Premier. Karen Tzventarny worked at Ornge as a nurse

for five years. As a medical professional, Karen was responsible for screening patient transfers for Ornge in the unit dedicated to controlling infectious disease. She said that she complained back in 2009 to the Ministry of Health after the now former CEO of Ornge replaced qualified medical personnel with less qualified staff.

I'd like to know if the Premier knows what the ministry's investigations of that complaint revealed.

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, I'll be glad to take the first question. I'm sure my colleague the minister will want to answer the others.

I can say that we have been very clear in terms of our disapproval of the activities that took place there, of the fact that the executive, the leadership, lost sight of their responsibility, first and foremost, to ensure that we're delivering the best possible care to Ontario patients, and secondly, to show respect for Ontario taxpayers.

We have moved together as a government, decisively. My honourable colleague knows that we have referred the matter to the OPP for a criminal investigation. We await the outcome of that investigation.

We have also made it clear that we are providing every co-operation that we possibly can to the Auditor General. That individual's office will be thorough in its examination of the issues. We look forward to receiving the recommendations and we look forward to acting on the basis of those recommendations.

My honourable colleague also knows that we are moving ahead with a series of initiatives that will increase accountability and oversight to ensure that we provide the best possible air ambulance care to Ontarians.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Well, Speaker, I suspect that the Premier's lack of response about the investigation is because there likely wasn't an investigation into that complaint.

Reports today indicate very clearly that that was not an isolated incident. Ornge executives replacing medical and aviation specialists with less qualified staff was apparently the norm in that organization. Fed up, this particular nurse, Ms. Tzventarny, ended up quitting her job in light of what was happening there.

Can the minister say how many complaints her ministry received from whistleblowers? And how many investigations did they conduct as a result of those complaints?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Health.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you to the member opposite, the leader of the third party. I can assure the member that we take every complaint very, very seriously. And every complaint is investigated, Speaker.

What I can tell you, though, is that we know we need to do more. That is why we have brought about very significant change at the leadership levels at Ornge. We have a new interim CEO. We have a new board. The board is taking the issue of patient safety extremely seriously.

But that alone is not enough. We need to do even more, and that is why I will shortly be introducing legis-

lation that will continue to improve the oversight and the quality of patient care at Ornge.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, day after day after day, the minister ignored the warnings—the warnings from nurses who were seeing a downgrading of the skills of their colleagues at that agency; warnings from accountants about financial irregularities and mismanagement; warnings from pilots and paramedics that the quality of care was being compromised at Ornge as the skills were being downgraded; and warnings from employees and MPPs in the Legislature about executive salaries and questionable contracts.

The minister obviously was not doing her job. Why should she be keeping it?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, my job is to fix the problems that I find, and in the health ministry, the province of Ontario, there are unfortunately problems that arise from time to time. My problem is to fix the problems that arise and take every step I can to ensure they do not happen again. That job is under way. We acted swiftly. We have replaced the leadership. They are very focused on patient safety issues, and so am I.

Speaker, I think it's important that we think about the patients who have been served by Ornge, and I'd like to share one story, if I might. A university student was at his cottage. He was barbecuing hamburgers and the propane barbecue exploded. After briefly losing consciousness, he realized his arms were on fire. He called 911. Ornge arrived and transported him to Sunnybrook. He says thank you to Ornge.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** To the Minister of Health: Speaker, yesterday the minister was alerted to yet more serious gaps in service at Ontario's air ambulance service. She was presented with a list of 13 recent incidents that put patients and front-line staff, paramedics and pilots at risk. These incidents are happening on a daily basis. Unqualified and inexperienced people are the reason. That's who's in charge at Ornge today. The minister may have called for a criminal investigation, but she's obviously oblivious to the operational gaps that are there in this place today.

Not only has this minister presided over the spawning of a financial scandal, but she has also failed to protect the integrity of our essential air ambulance services. I ask the minister once again: Given her inability to manage this file, will she agree to step aside?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** As I have said, we take every concern that is raised very seriously. I did have the opportunity of sharing the list that the member presented me with yesterday. I have raised those issues with Ornge. They've looked into them, and it appears that each one of those incidents had in fact been investigated by the people at Ornge.

The member opposite is playing a political game; I understand that. He wants a minister's head on a platter.

What I am focused on is patient safety. We have a new board in place. Dr. Barry McLellan—impeccable credentials—is heading up the patient safety focus of the new board. I have every confidence in the new leadership and in the front-line staff that this member seems intent on destroying.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** It's that front-line staff who are bringing these concerns to my attention. That's why we're raising them here: because the minister isn't listening. It's this kind of rhetoric that continues to undermine the confidence of that front-line staff.

What we want to know is, why hasn't the minister put people in charge who are qualified and experienced in air ambulance to get things right? With all due respect—we have the highest regard for Mr. McKelvie. He knows nothing about air ambulance services, knows nothing about air ambulances and knows nothing about the issue. There are people in the public service who have that experience. Why hasn't the minister put them in charge?

Again, she has shown she's incapable of dealing with this file. Why will she not admit that she is the single impediment to getting things right at Ornge?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated. Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** As I said earlier, the member opposite is playing a game of politics. I understand that. I am focused on improving the quality of care at Ornge. I am focused on ensuring that patients have the air ambulance care that they need.

The member opposite, when the new board was revealed, himself admitted in the media that it was a very strong board. If he now wishes to say that Ian Delaney is not a strong chair, if he now wishes to say that Barry McLellan is not a strong member of the board—if he wants to cast aspersions on a very, very strong leadership team at Ornge, he is free to do that. I stand behind the new leadership and I stand behind the front-line staff.

I can tell you that I have received messages from front-line staff who are very, very pleased with the changes that have been made.

1100

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** Ma question est pour la ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée.

We're now looking at bankruptcy documents for one of Ornge's many, many for-profit businesses, called Ornge Global Holdings. It shows that this company owes nearly \$14,000 to a Brazilian law firm. I want to know: Is the minister aware of the Brazilian business that's going on, and does she think that throwing taxpayers' money around Brazil is a good use of public health care dollars?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** The member opposite knows that we have turned over—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** That's enough, please. As I said before, this is a difficult topic that needs to be discussed, and it will be discussed. I need to hear the answers, as does everyone.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, as the member knows, this matter has been turned over to the Ontario Provincial Police. They are conducting their investigation. They will go exactly where they determine they need to go.

I can assure you that the forensic audit team, the Auditor General, my ministry staff and the people at Ornge are fully co-operating with the Ontario Provincial Police. That was a step that, unfortunately, did need to be taken. We must all do what we have to do to see that justice is done, and that means letting the OPP do their job.

What is very important is that we are turning the page at Ornge. I will be introducing legislation that will bring our air ambulance service under the Excellent Care for All legislation, because we believe that quality should be measured and quality should be improved.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** Well, families are rather surprised to find that their publicly funded air ambulance services ran a for-profit company called Ornge Global Brazil Holdings. It was only one of a web of for-profit companies created by Ornge, by a team of high-priced lawyers. All of those private companies always meant the same thing: They meant big bucks for well-connected insiders. Former Liberal Party president Alfred Apps has received \$9 million so far for his work for those private companies, and the document shows that he's still owed tens of thousands of dollars by Ornge.

When David Caplan faced the same thing, when he let well-connected insiders divert public money away from front-line care, he did the honourable thing: He stepped aside. Why does the minister think that she shouldn't do the same? Why does she think that she can keep her job?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** What I would suggest is, if the member opposite has allegations, please refer them to the Ontario Provincial Police. This investigation is under way right now.

What I can tell you, Speaker, is when the new board was put in place, they were given very clear instructions: Focus first on patient safety, support the forensic audit process that was under way, and wind down the for-profit. Those for-profit companies are in the process of being wound down because we want the new Ornge to be focused on Ontario patients: getting those Ontario patients to the care they need as quickly as possible.

## ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Grant Crack:** My question's for the Minister of Economic Development and Innovation. The eastern Ontario economic development fund has been a successful program that has provided a tremendous economic boost to communities throughout eastern Ontario, including in

my riding of Glengarry–Prescott–Russell. Our government has invested \$53 million in the eastern Ontario development fund, which has leveraged \$503 million in private sector investments. That's an 8 to 1 ratio of leverage that's created and supported 11,700 jobs.

I was honoured to have the Minister of Economic Development and Innovation visit my riding last week, and together we met with the Eastern Ontario Wardens' Caucus to discuss how the fund could be improved. Speaker, will the minister take the recommendations of the community, including those of the wardens, into account when considering—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

The Minister of Economic Development and Innovation.

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** I want to thank the member for his question and for the great tour we had of his riding, an opportunity to meet some of his constituents.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that residents in eastern Ontario understand just how important the eastern Ontario development fund has been as a job creation tool to those communities. Job creation and economic growth are the key priorities of this government and I know that communities in eastern Ontario really do support this.

I would like to thank, as well, the eastern wardens' caucus for the leadership that they have demonstrated as a champion of this fund, not only on the provincial level but out in their communities as well. I was very pleased with the principles that they put forward, and in fact, one of the principles that they think is key is making this fund permanent, which is exactly what we're trying to do. I looked forward to their input. It was thoughtful. We had a valuable discussion, and we take it very seriously. I hope, though, that the opposition take their views just as seriously—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. Grant Crack:** Thank you, Speaker, and thank you, Minister.

Speaker, some members of the House and some in my constituency have raised concerns regarding the levels of available funding under the eastern Ontario development fund. The fund was established in 2008, with the four-year period set to expire in March 2012. As I understand it, the fund was allocated up to \$20 million a year for each of the four years. To date, approximately \$53 million has been invested, leveraging about \$500 million of private investment into the region. While the fund has been a huge success, creating and supporting 11,700 jobs, why was the full amount of each year not spent, and do unspent dollars in any given year carry on to subsequent years?

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** That's a good question. The eastern Ontario development fund was designed to provide up to—and I repeat: up to—\$20 million annually to those projects that meet our due diligence as well as our accountability criteria. I'm pleased to confirm that I have been advised that every company that applied to the

eastern Ontario development fund and that met the criteria has indeed received funding.

Let's be clear, though: Our budgets are allocated on an annual basis, based on the demand for such projects. Any amounts below the \$20-million maximum that are not allocated don't carry forward into the next year. A great deal of effort is made to ensure that Ontario taxpayers are getting value for these investments. These investments are highly scrutinized, and recipients are held accountable. Perhaps that's why this really good program gets such a great private sector leverage return—because we scrutinize very, very closely, and we make sure that those companies are very accountable for the investments that we make in them. I hope this clarifies that for the member.

### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** To the Minister of Health: Ontario's air ambulance service has been embroiled in controversy for months—financial scandal, blatant abuse of tax dollars, senior executives and the entire board of directors fired, daily reports of incidents that put patients and crews at risk. And yet, as recently as yesterday, the Minister of Health, under whose watch this scandal brewed and service levels were compromised, had this to say about that air ambulance service: "Ornge has a world-class ambulance service."

Speaker, if there isn't anything more but that statement in itself that shows that this member has lost all perspective, nothing else will. Surely that statement alone should tell the Premier this his minister should resign—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Minister.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, the member opposite is free to criticize me—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** It was dead silent during the question, and I want it dead silent during the answer.

Carry on.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, the member opposite is free to criticize me; I understand that. But when the member opposite veers into—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Renfrew has a warning.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:**—questioning the integrity of the front-line staff, that is where I draw the line. The front-line staff at Ornge are delivering world-class service, and if you want to criticize the people who are saving lives every day, I have to challenge that. The doctors, the nurses, the paramedics, the pilots, those people who are servicing the planes and the helicopters, they are superb public servants of this province of Ontario.

1110

Have there been problems? Yes. Have we addressed those problems? Yes. Do we need to do more? Yes, we do, and that is why we're introducing legislation that will

bring Ornge under the Excellent Care for All legislation that will enshrine oversight in law.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Stop the clock. Be seated, please.

Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** It's those front-line staff who are calling into question the integrity of the minister. That's why we are here having this debate.

When will this minister put patients and the air ambulance service of our province ahead of her own sense of importance? What makes this minister think that, given her track record of allowing the integrity of our air ambulance service to be undermined, her personal political career is more important than the integrity of the air ambulance service?

I ask the minister—it is her complete lack of leadership that has resulted in the circumstances that we find at Ornge today. Given that, will she put our air ambulance service, those front-line staff to whom she refers—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Question?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Will she put them ahead of herself and resign as minister—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Thank you.

Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** You know, Speaker, we may have our differences, but the member opposite and I also share a very fundamental value. That is that we want the very best care for the people in this province, the people who need our health care system, be it through air ambulance or through our entire health care system.

My responsibility is to fix the issues that arise. I have moved decisively to fix what was wrong, and I am moving decisively on introducing legislation, developing a new performance agreement, that will not only ensure much higher oversight going forward, but attempt to restore the confidence in Ornge that this member seems to try to disparage.

I'm asking the member opposite to support the new legislation that we will be introducing shortly to enhance the oversight and transparency at Ornge.

### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** To the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care: Speaking to reporters last Friday, the minister said that Ornge would be subject to oversight from the Ontario Legislature through the Standing Committee on Government Agencies.

My question is simple: Now that she has had some time to think about it, does the minister still believe that this is the case?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, what I can tell you is that if it is the will of the Legislature that they look at Ornge, I will be nothing but supportive of that decision. In fact, as we introduce legislation to enhance over-

sight and transparency at Ornge, I have every expectation that this will be the subject of a committee.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** The minister sets her expectations quite low, and she knows that despite recent changes, Ornge is not a government agency and cannot be called before committee. They're also not subject to freedom-of-information rules. That's no accident: Ornge was strategically designed this way.

Mr. Speaker, why did the McGuinty government design Ornge to be free from public scrutiny?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, what this question indicates to me is that that member, and presumably his party, will be fully supportive of the legislation we will be introducing to enhance transparency and oversight. That is what we know we need to do, and that is what we are going to be doing. So I look forward to continued conversations with the third party and with the opposition party as we do what we need to do to strengthen oversight at Ornge.

### COMMUNITY SAFETY

**Mr. David Zimmer:** My question is for the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services. Minister, recently you introduced a bill that would repeal the Public Works Protection Act. I understand that the act is an outdated piece of legislation; in fact, it dates back to 1939 and it was enforced in the context of World War II. But recently, during the G20 meeting in Toronto, there was much criticism—justified criticism—that the legislation was in need of revision.

Minister, it may seem obvious, but for the record, can you explain why you're proposing to repeal this piece of legislation?

**Hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** I'd like to thank the member from Willowdale for this important question. Protecting both safety and the rights of Ontarians is a top priority for our government. The McGuinty government is acting to update the legislation that protects our important facilities. In 2010, the McGuinty government called upon former Ontario Chief Justice Roy McMurtry to review the legislation. We are now acting on his recommendations.

The proposed new legislation strikes the right balance between the need to safeguard our courts and power-generating facilities with the need to protect the civil rights of Ontarians. I would encourage all members of this House to support the changes to this legislation to keep our communities safe and protect the rights of all Ontarians.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. David Zimmer:** Thank you, Minister. I appreciate that protecting public safety and at the same time respecting individual rights and freedoms is a very delicate balance. Minister, what stakeholder groups have you consulted, what sectors of the community have you consulted with in order to get the balance of this legislation correct so that we have an effective piece of legis-

lation that protects the community and preserves the individual rights of our citizens?

**Hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me thank very much Justice McMurtry and the Ombudsman for their good recommendations.

We have consulted with court security officials, the nuclear power industry, our justice partners, municipalities and civil liberty advocates. If passed, the new legislation will maintain the security of our courts and nuclear and other power-generating facilities. It would also require that any new security powers be given through legislation, creating public awareness and accountability.

Overall, Mr. Speaker, we are ensuring the protection of our key infrastructure while at the same time ensuring that all Ontarians are not subject to any more regulation than is needed to accomplish that goal.

### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** My question is for the Minister of Health. Minister, we now have evidence that a critically ill child, a newborn baby boy in Windsor, did wait four and a half hours for an air ambulance to take him to London. In fact, doctors were so worried about this delay that they sent the baby to Detroit instead, for fear that if he waited any longer he'd die.

We have now discovered that that was not the first time a critically ill or injured patient at Waterloo Regional faced transfer delays that caused doctors concern. In fact, they had sent out a memo to staff on January 27, telling people: Send them to Detroit when you deem that a delay is going to be detrimental.

I ask you: The people at Ornge want to do the best job they can, but they can't if they can't get to the patient. Minister, is this the world-class air ambulance service that you bragged about yesterday, that Ontarians should expect in the future?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I am familiar with the case that the member has raised. What is important is that that child got the care that the child needed. The interests of the patient will always come first.

You know, Speaker, I have confidence in our front-line staff to make those split-second decisions that they must make when they are dealing with critically ill people. I think it's important that the member opposite understands that there is a protocol to report and improve quality. We want to do even more, Speaker; that is why we will be introducing legislation to bring Ornge under the Excellent Care for All legislation so that just like hospitals, they will publicly report on quality indicators and they will have a continual plan to improve quality.

1120

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** To the minister again: You acknowledged yesterday that you didn't know anything about the Windsor and London situations, and we now learn that this is a common problem in Windsor. I also want to remind you that in your own backyard, air

ambulance was not available for four consecutive nights last week because there were no pilots.

Minister, the public is concerned that lives are continuing to be put at risk. They have lost confidence in your ability to oversee this urgent care service. Indeed, this loss of confidence was reflected this morning when 83% of the people polled on AM640 said you should resign. I ask you, will you do the honourable thing and resign?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Minister.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I suspect that if there was a poll of the people asking, "Do we want to make Ornge stronger?" the answer would be 100% yes, we want to make it stronger. That is why we have put in place strong new leadership who are focused on exactly the issues that other members in this Legislature are focused on.

Under the leadership of Ian Delaney, we have a very strong board, one that Frank Klees himself described as a step in the right direction. These are very competent people. Frank Klees said that, Speaker.

Elizabeth Witmer said, in 2007 when they were debating Bill 171, "I know our party"—their party—"certainly can take some pride in what we have done ... to create a world-renowned air and land ambulance service." Elizabeth Witmer again—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Today, Premier, you answered a question from the Leader of the Opposition saying that education was the basis for a strong economy. You've ruled out cuts to full-day kindergarten, but you haven't ruled out the Drummond commission recommendations to cut funding to schools by almost \$3 billion.

If you indeed believe that investment in education is crucial to a skilled workforce and economic success, why won't the Premier rule out those cuts put forward by Mr. Drummond?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Education.

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** I'm pleased to have an opportunity to talk about the advice that we've received from Don Drummond. Don Drummond has given us a great deal of advice, and we're taking that into account and looking at it in the context of advice that we get from other important experts in the educational field; for example, how we can continue to see our student success rates go up.

But let's be very clear: Our government has had a constant focus on increasing the success in public education. Funding has gone up by 46% since 2003. Our students are doing the best in the world. Our grad rates are up. Our test scores are up.

The Premier has been absolutely clear that we will take Don Drummond's advice in the context of examining that and many issues, and we will make our decisions and make that clear in the upcoming budget.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** Well, Speaker, parents are paying higher and higher fees for public education. Schools already lack adequate staffing. Now the McGuinty government is considering cutting 10,000 staff from our hard-pressed school system; cutting funding from classroom supplies, textbooks and computers by 25%; and charging fees for busing.

Parents are anxious; they're worried about their children's future. The Premier had to act and speak out that he was going to protect full-day kindergarten. Will he now give parents and their families assurance that these cuts recommended by Drummond will not go forward?

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** I do want to highlight that absolutely yes, we made it clear that full-day kindergarten would go ahead. And why did we do that? Because registration is as we speak. Families are planning for the school year ahead, and we knew that those families needed clarity. I myself have been in those families' shoes, and I understand the importance of families planning for next September.

But, Speaker, let's be clear: Our government has invested in public education. We will take Don Drummond's recommendations in the context of ensuring that the steps that we take to find a sustainable pathway to public education are ones that protect the gains that we've made.

My friend opposite rises up and he has a lot of anxiety, but the curious thing is that in the last election campaign, the NDP didn't even have an education platform. We've always been clear about our focus on public education. We will continue to do that, and we will take Don Drummond's recommendations in that light.

### ABORIGINAL LAND CLAIMS

**Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** I've got a question today for the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. I think there's an awareness in this House, on all sides, that our many aboriginal issues, particularly when it comes to land claims—that in order to achieve success, we've got to work together with our First Nations partners and with the federal government. It came as a surprise recently when the member from Haldimand-Norfolk stated to the media that the federal government has indicated that there is no valid land claim in the Haldimand tract area. Yet just this weekend, the federal MP for Brant stated that Canada stands ready to settle Six Nations land claims.

Mr. Speaker, would the minister please advise this House, the people of Ontario, and clarify this for us and tell us just what is accurate information?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Thank you to the member for Oakville for his question.

I've had many conversations on this issue since I was appointed to this role in the fall. I've had the opportunity

to visit the community, to visit Caledonia and Six Nations to meet with the chief, some council members and area mayors. I can tell you that in all of those interactions, the message is quite clear: The federal government needs to come back to the negotiating table and to resolve this 200-year-old land claim.

Now, the federal government has been absent for a number of years, but I'm glad to see some encouraging words from the MP for Brant. Now we'd like to see action. We continue to urge the federal government to come back. But the land claim is only one part of the solution. We need conversations to happen with the confederacy and the local residents as well—bringing all the community members together is a necessity at this point. Any solution to the challenges in the community has to come forward from the community, and we're making it a priority to find those practical solutions.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** I think we'd all agree that having those conversations is important. Many members of this House travelled around with the Select Committee on Mental Health and Addictions and we heard exactly that when we travelled to First Nations communities. Now, constructive discussion and peaceful negotiations are obviously preferable to confrontation or unproductive negative commentary.

February 28 will mark the sixth anniversary of the events at Douglas Creek Estates. What actions has the government engaged in to date to find solutions to the challenges that are faced by residents in the Haldimand area?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** From my perspective, opening that conversation is the first step in determining the concrete actions that need to go forward. It's not for the government to step in unilaterally and decide the way forward for the community. That has to be part of the community members' solution—coming forward and coming up with long-term solutions that they can live with.

As a first step, what we're proposing is that we get all parties to the table to discuss potential uses for the DCE lands. Finding a use for the lands that Haldimand residents and Six Nations members can all agree on, I think, is an integral part of repairing the relationships in that region. In addition, we'll continue to urge the federal government to come and rekindle the negotiation process.

But it's important to remember that at the heart of the matter is a 200-year-old land claim that only the federal government can resolve. They have to come back to the negotiating table to resolve that. It would be very helpful if the members opposite would call their friends in Ottawa and ask the federal government—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** My question is for the Minister of Health. It involves the northern base of Ornge's air service in Thunder Bay. Today we have learned that Ornge

is now unable to guarantee 24-hour, seven-days-a-week air service to northern Ontario. The continuing problems are that there aren't enough medics or pilots available, or that the aircraft are out of service.

Minister, will you please stand here today and guarantee to the residents of northern Ontario that air ambulance service will be available on a 24/7 basis, fully staffed with critical care medics and pilots?

**1130**

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** The quality of care that Ornge provides is, of course, dependent on access to that service. What I will undertake to do is to look into this particular situation and get back to the member with details on that situation.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** As if the Thunder Bay slap to northern Ontario wasn't enough, we've also learned that Ornge plans to cancel emergency helicopter service to the First Nation residents of Moosonee. Minister, are they not deserving of the same level of emergency care as the rest of Ontario? Minister, will you stand up today and guarantee full air ambulance service to the First Nations and residents of Moosonee, and if not, will you resign?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** What I can assure the member of is that I will look into this situation. But I can assure you, Speaker, that 24/7 service will be provided to the people of northern Ontario. The people of northern Ontario deserve access to health care the same as everyone else. In fact, a very high percentage of the work that Ornge does is in northern Ontario. I will get back to the member with more details but, yes, I can ensure 24/7 service.

#### HEALTH CARE

**Ms. Sarah Campbell:** My question is to the Minister of Health. A month ago I wrote to the Minister of Health, urging her to address the ongoing problems in primary and emergency care in Rainy River. I invited the minister to come to my riding, sit down with health providers and community members, and finally come up with a solution that will work in the long term. One month later and I have not received a response, and we are now facing a crisis. I have a copy of that letter and a new one that I will ask a page to hand-deliver to the Minister of Health.

The only doctor who is left in Rainy River is leaving his position as of April after concluding, and this is a quote from him, "that the Ministry of Health has no interest in fixing the problem." Why is the minister forcing Rainy River into a crisis situation rather than working with us to solve the issue?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you for the question, and I welcome the invitation to come to Rainy River.

What I do want to say is that we are aware of the emergency department issues in Rainy River. We're working very hard to ensure the coverage that is required. I do want to say that I'm very happy to know that the

emergency department is now fully covered until April 5. The member opposite has raised issues before, worried about coverage over Christmas holidays, for example; we fixed that. We've now got coverage until April 5.

I can tell you that we are working hard to ensure that there is access to care throughout the province, and that is part of the reason why we are bringing primary care under the umbrella of the LHINs. It is at the LHIN level, the regional level, that primary care can be delivered—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Ms. Sarah Campbell:** It's a systemic issue. It's not a problem at the LHIN level; it's a systemic issue.

This doctor has been sounding alarm bells for years. The situation for family doctors in communities like Rainy River is untenable and it means that we are unable to recruit permanent family doctors. The minister knows all of this, yet she keeps hoping that the problems will somehow magically disappear. Well, they won't. The system as it now stands is broken. Will the minister commit to working with me and health care officials to create a strategy that works for Rainy River and other northern communities?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, what I can tell you is that this government has been very focused on ensuring that there is health coverage in the north. That is why we opened a new medical school in northern Ontario called the Northern Ontario School of Medicine. It is now graduating doctors who are from the north, who want to practise in the north, and they are training extraordinarily fine physicians. The people of northern Ontario are the beneficiaries of that investment today and they will continue to be as this Northern Ontario School of Medicine continues to graduate physicians who specifically want to work in the north.

The hospital in Rainy River is continuing to work with HealthForceOntario to ensure that there is adequate coverage.

The member opposite and I want the very same thing, and that's for there to be coverage for the people she represents. We are taking steps to do the very best we can to ensure that happens.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Cambridge on a point of order.

**Mr. Rob Leone:** Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order: During question period today, the Premier used the word "dumb" in relation to a quotation he supposedly got from the Drummond report in relation to the Leader of the Opposition's proposal for a public sector wage freeze. Mr. Speaker, the only mention of the word "dumb" is in recommendation 3.2, which talks about and discusses across-the-board cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Premier withdraw that statement and apologize to the Leader of the Opposition.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** That's not a point of order. The member should know that members can correct their own record on Hansard and that's the way it works here. It's not a point of order.

## DEFERRED VOTES

### HEALTHY HOMES RENOVATION TAX CREDIT ACT, 2012

#### LOI DE 2012 SUR LE CRÉDIT D'IMPÔT POUR L'AMÉNAGEMENT DU LOGEMENT AXÉ SUR LE BIEN-ÊTRE

Deferred vote on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 2, An Act to amend the Taxation Act, 2007 to implement a healthy homes renovation tax credit / *Projet de loi 2, Loi modifiant la Loi de 2007 sur les impôts en vue de mettre en oeuvre le crédit d'impôt pour l'aménagement du logement axé sur le bien-être.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Call in the members. This will be a five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1137 to 1142.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Members take your seats, please.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Members, I am serious. I'd better not say that in front of your leader because he's not in his seat yet, either.

I would beg your indulgence when it is time to seat. It should not take this long.

On November 29, 2011, Mr. Milloy moved second reading of Bill 2. All those in favour will rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Ayes

Albanese, Laura  
Armstrong, Teresa J.  
Balkissoon, Bas  
Bartolucci, Rick  
Bentley, Christopher  
Berardinetti, Lorenzo  
Best, Margaret  
Bisson, Gilles  
Bradley, James J.  
Broten, Laurel C.  
Campbell, Sarah  
Cansfield, Donna H.  
Chan, Michael  
Chiarelli, Bob  
Colle, Mike  
Coteau, Michael  
Crack, Grant  
Craitor, Kim  
Damerla, Dipika  
Delaney, Bob  
Dhillon, Vic  
Dickson, Joe  
DiNovo, Cheri

Duguid, Brad  
Duncan, Dwight  
Flynn, Kevin Daniel  
Forster, Cindy  
Gerretsen, John  
Gélinas, France  
Gravelle, Michael  
Horwath, Andrea  
Hoskins, Eric  
Jaczek, Helena  
Jeffrey, Linda  
Kwintar, Monte  
Leal, Jeff  
MacCharles, Tracy  
Mangat, Amrit  
Mantha, Michael  
Marchese, Rosario  
Matthews, Deborah  
Mauro, Bill  
McGuinty, Dalton  
McMeekin, Ted  
McNeely, Phil  
Meilleur, Madeleine

Miller, Paul  
Milloy, John  
Moridi, Reza  
Murray, Glen R.  
Naqvi, Yasir  
Natyshak, Taras  
Oraziotti, David  
Piruzza, Teresa  
Prue, Michael  
Qaadri, Shafiq  
Sandals, Liz  
Schein, Jonah  
Sergio, Mario  
Singh, Jagmeet  
Sorbara, Greg  
Sousa, Charles  
Tabas, Peter  
Takhur, Harinder S.  
Taylor, Monique  
Vanthof, John  
Wong, Soo  
Wynne, Kathleen O.  
Zimmer, David

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** All those opposed will rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Nays

Amott, Ted  
Bailey, Robert  
Barrett, Toby  
Cleudigh, Ted  
Clark, Steve  
Dunlop, Garfield

Jackson, Rod  
Jones, Sylvia  
Klees, Frank  
Leone, Rob  
MacLaren, Jack  
MacLeod, Lisa

O'Toole, John  
Ouellette, Jerry J.  
Pettapiece, Randy  
Scott, Laurie  
Shurman, Peter  
Smith, Todd

Elliott, Christine  
Fedeli, Victor  
Hardeman, Ernie  
Harris, Michael  
Hillier, Randy  
Hudak, Tim

McDonell, Jim  
McKenna, Jane  
McNaughton, Monte  
Milligan, Rob E.  
Munro, Julia  
Nicholls, Rick

Thompson, Lisa M.  
Walker, Bill  
Wilson, Jim  
Witmer, Elizabeth  
Yakubski, John  
Yurek, Jeff

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### HORSE RACING INDUSTRY

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):** The ayes are 69; the nays are 36.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I declare the motion carried.

*Second reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** I ask that the bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** So ordered.

This House stands recessed until 1 p.m. this afternoon.

*The House recessed from 1147 to 1300.*

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Mr. John O'Toole:** I know they may not be here, but I was out today in the front yard on a demonstration on breed-specific bans. My constituents, Madge MacBeth-Goodfellow and Mike MacBeth-Goodfellow, I expect were out there; I expect them to be here. I'd like to welcome them to the Ontario Legislature and let them know my position on Bill 16.

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** I was remiss this morning in not introducing one last person that I should have, and I'd like to correct that matter. Wendell Palmer from the Niagara area was here to support my maiden speech, and so we'd like to welcome Wendell Palmer to the Legislative Assembly.

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** At this point, I'd like to have the entire Legislature welcome my brother, Gurratan Dhaliwal, today. He's in the—

*Applause.*

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** In case you're seeing double, that is my brother; and also, my good friend and classmate at Osgoode Hall Law School, Terry Taoussanopoulos.

**Ms. Soo Wong:** Shortly, I want to recognize a group of students coming from one of my schools, Sir Alexander MacKenzie Senior Public School, to the Legislature. They will be coming in. The students' names are Yin Wang, Holden Milligan, Ashley Jones, as well as the teacher, Ms. Barchha.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further introductions?

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. They're not here yet, but they will be arriving en masse, and I'd like to welcome in advance the Dog Legislation Council of Canada, the Canadian Kennel Club and a number of other groups that are here to hear the second bill discussed.

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** Fifteen years ago, an agreement was made between the Ontario government, the horse racing industry and municipalities that allowed slots at racetracks on a mutually agreed revenue-sharing basis. Since that time, Ontario's horse racing industry has thrived and has become a destination for North American horse racing.

Between the year 2000 and today, wages and salaries sustained by the industry are up 50%. Annual expenditures from the industry are up 67% and revenues realized by federal, provincial and municipal governments have increased by 27%.

Over the past nine years, under this government's watch Ontario has slipped to become a have-not province. Our credit rating is being threatened by a ballooning debt and businesses are being forced to close or leave Ontario for other jurisdictions.

By misrepresenting the slots for the racetracks program as a subsidy, this government is choosing to end a program that supports the second-largest subsector of the agricultural economy: 60,000 jobs a year and millions of dollars in revenue.

The fact is, the government receives 80% of slot revenues and over \$260 million in revenues from horse racing. The government is going to kill the goose that lays the golden egg each and every year. The fact is, when it comes to rural economy, this government has turned a blind eye for nine years. The fact is, horse racing is good for Ontario.

### HEALTH PROMOTION

**Mr. Paul Miller:** Like many of you, a great deal of my childhood was spent cultivating a lifelong love of sports. Though my knees aren't what they used to be, my passion remains with a healthy and active lifestyle.

I recently met with representatives of the Heart and Stroke Foundation and the Canadian Cancer Society to discuss their Healthiest Province campaign, highlighting the impact of health promotion on our health care system.

Early learning about the benefits of nutrition and exercise shapes lifelong habits and teaches children to value an active lifestyle, which will reduce their dependence on the health care system as adults.

Team sports are a simple and effective way to ensure that our children get the exercise they need. On March 9, I will be speaking at the Hamilton Soccer Hall of Fame. This organization honours athletic contributions that individuals have made in their communities. The inductees have set a positive example for Hamilton youth, promoting the benefit of sports and recreation.

I encourage all of our constituents to sign up their children for team sports and enjoy a healthy lifestyle for the whole family. Regardless of your game of choice,

there's no denying that staying active makes us all healthier.

### RIDING OF NIAGARA FALLS

**Mr. Kim Craitor:** It is with the greatest pleasure that I inform the House, the people of Ontario and the people of Canada that a major event will take place in my riding of Niagara Falls this summer. Last Wednesday, the Niagara Parks Commission passed, unanimously, a vote to allow Nik Wallenda's proposal to be the first person in over 120 years to cross Niagara Falls on the high wire. This permission came after the Governor of New York state, Andrew Cuomo, signed into state law legislation allowing Mr. Wallenda to cross the falls from their side as well.

This event will be seen all over the world, live on television, and will bring attention to the area for months leading up to the actual walk and certainly for years afterwards. The economic impact, as studied by Enigma Research here in Toronto, has been predicted to be up to at least \$120 million. Already, the press has been staggering. Since this approval, Nik has done interviews from Barcelona to Taiwan, from Austria to Australia, from China to Peru, from the New York Times to the London Times. It's only the beginning.

Nik is a seventh-generation member of the famed Flying Wallenda family of over 200 years. I have personally had the pleasure to know Nik and meet with him while he was going through this process—a family man through and through, a devoted husband and the father of three. I would love everyone from around the world to come to Niagara Falls this summer to watch a worldwide historic event.

### DOG OWNERSHIP

**Mrs. Julia Munro:** Later today in private members' time, we will be debating Bill 16, which would repeal the pit bull ban in Ontario. This amendment represents the failure of government seven years ago. This amendment also represents the loss of trust people have in this government.

Seven years ago, people who obeyed the law, worked hard and paid taxes found themselves on the wrong side of the law. They discovered that their happy, healthy family pet had them on the wrong side of the law. He looked like a pit bull type of dog. Even then, these owners felt there was a mistake. How could their government betray them? After all, since pre-industrial times, people who share the parliamentary tradition that we have know they are innocent until proven guilty.

Little did they know that that fundamental principle of democratic government had been removed in this act. People woke up to a new reality. These families would have to mount a defence to prove that their family pet was not a pit bull type. Untold thousands could not afford to mount a legal defence. Thousands of dogs were

euthanized. This had nothing to do with dangerous dogs; it had everything to do with a political agenda.

### REFUGEES

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Mr. Speaker, last night in my riding, we had a powerful and moving event. It was a candlelight vigil for the Roma refugees and immigrants in my riding. There were about 300 people there, and when asked if they had ever experienced violence in their home countries, many of them coming from European Union countries like Hungary and the former Czechoslovakia, all of them put their hands up. We asked them if they had ever experienced oppression or racism. All of them, including the children, put their hands up.

They were there for another reason too, and that's a draconian bill, Bill C-31, that's being brought in by the federal government under the auspices of Jason Kenney. It's a bill that will limit even more Roma people from being able to seek refugee status in this country; we only accept 2% of those who are applying now.

1310

I also remind the members that Roma were victims of the Holocaust as well: Two million Roma were killed by the Nazis during the Holocaust years. Now, the least we can do is to accept those who are already being faced with deportation from home countries, who are faced with imprisonment and violence and draconian laws throughout Europe.

We strongly oppose this bill. We ask that the government here do what they can to oppose it when they're dealing with the federal government, and we ask all members to be very aware of the plight of the Roma people, not only here in Ontario—although they are here—but everywhere in the world.

### ED ARNOLD

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** There are people throughout our lifetimes whom we respect for their leadership and their contribution to our communities. In Peterborough, one of these individuals is Ed Arnold. For 40 years, Ed Arnold has managed the Peterborough Examiner newspaper. To quote the Examiner staff, "He announced his retirement and the power went out."

Ed Arnold was born and raised in Peterborough and graduated from my high school, Kenner Collegiate, where his name now appears on their wall of honour. His newspaper career began shortly after that. In his youth, he worked for the Examiner and the Globe and Mail delivering newspapers.

After graduating college in 1985, he became the managing editor of the Peterborough Examiner. His 40 years of reporting the news would shape the views and attitudes of the residents of Peterborough on many, many issues.

His reporting was factual and honest. Ed liked good-news stories. When asked what news events stayed with him throughout his career, his recollections immediately

go to the human side of the news. Although he covered all facets of the news, he had a compassion for the human story.

Ed Arnold not only cared about reporting the news; he was passionate about his community. He was a tireless volunteer, working with local charities, sports organizations and local projects, many of which benefit children in our community. These contributions were recognized many times over. He was the recipient of the Rotary Club Paul Harris award and the Ontario medal of citizenship, and his name appears on the Pathway of Fame in Peterborough. He is the author of 11 books and has received international recognition for his work on *The Flying Bandit*.

Ed Arnold's name is synonymous with the Examiner. Although we will all wish Ed well in his retirement, his professionalism, his insight, his compassion, his humour and his love of reporting the news will be greatly missed by the people in Peterborough.

### LIVE BAIT INDUSTRY

**Ms. Laurie Scott:** The live bait industry in Ontario is important to anglers, bait and tackle shops, and the harvesters who make their living in this field. On June 29 of last year, the Canadian Food Inspection Agency confirmed the presence of viral haemorrhagic septicaemia, or VHS, in Lake Simcoe, and advised MNR on July 5.

However, MNR decided not to make this public until December 14, when they advised bait harvest licence holders of the presence of VHS, and that as of January 1, 2012, an import-export ban would be imposed for their minnows beyond the Lake Simcoe management zone. Approximately 50% of the harvest is shipped to bait and tackle shops all over Ontario, particularly in the north.

The harvesting of minnows for the ice fishing season occurs during the fall. Because these small businesses were kept in the dark by MNR, many of them invested tens of thousands of dollars in their harvest, only to have 50% of their markets closed to them, making it impossible to recoup their investments.

For over six months, MNR allowed these minnows to be shipped all over the province without restriction, yet imposed an arbitrary embargo date of January 1, which will force many of these small businesses into bankruptcy. This is a terrible example of mismanagement of our natural resources by this government, which in this case will result in lost livelihoods. It is shameful, Mr. Speaker.

### SUICIDE PREVENTION

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** I want to take this time to talk about a very difficult issue, and that is suicide. Suicides break families and grieve our community. Youth or teen suicide, Speaker, is an even more difficult challenge, due to bullying or mental health issues.

We, in our community, as we have spoken in the House, have had many instances of suicides lately taking

place among young people recently. Most notably, Councillor Allan Hubley's son took his life.

As a result, Speaker, our community wanted to do something so that we can prevent suicides, especially among our young people, in the future. The member from Nepean–Carleton and I got together because we recognized that this is not a partisan issue. We worked along with Councillor Allan Hubley, and we also enlisted the support of Steve Madely from CFRA Ottawa, a radio personality who's very well known in the community. And we worked along with the Ottawa Community Suicide Prevention Network, a group of 40 organizations that have been working together to look into strategies to prevent suicide.

On February 8, a symposium was held in Ottawa to launch an action plan to make Ottawa a suicide-safe community. There are five pillars to that plan, Speaker: leadership; training to improve mental health literacy; suicide bereavement for those who are affected; mental health promotion; and creation of a community action plan, to be completed within a year.

All of our community, the provincial government, the municipal government and the leadership of Dr. Isra Levy and Mayor Watson have come together. We're hoping the federal government will come to the table as well so that we can make Ottawa a suicide-safe community. Thank you, Speaker.

**Mr. Randy Hillier:** Point of order.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Let me get this statement out of the way.

The member from Huron–Bruce.

### TOWN OF GODERICH

**Ms. Lisa M. Thompson:** It's going to be hockey night in Goderich when Goderich wins the title of Kraft Hockeyville 2012. I'm pleased to rise today, Mr. Speaker, and pledge my support for the town of Goderich to be named the winner of Kraft Hockeyville 2012.

Goderich is a town of unbelievable spirit. As you know, last August, an F3 tornado touched down in the centre of town, destroying the centre square of Canada's prettiest town. Their tornado destroyed homes, businesses and cultural landmarks. As devastated as the community was, they picked up and lent a helping hand. They've worked their way back to getting the community back on track.

The top 15 communities for Hockeyville will be named on March 3, and I'm confident Goderich will be in the mix. Goderich started Hockeyville Fridays where people are encouraged to wear their hockey jerseys to work and school every day in support of their bid. They've held residential decorating concerts where homeowners are encouraged to decorate the front of their homes and share their spirit as well. The Goderich Hockeyville bid has almost 2,000 fans on Facebook, and I'm pleased to promote them on my MPP website.

Kraft Hockeyville has lifted the spirits of a town that was literally torn apart last August. It's amazing to see

this community rise above adversity. I look forward to announcing their win later this year. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

Member from Lanark, Frontenac, Lenington and Addington.

**Mr. Randy Hillier:** Lennox and Addington. Very good. Sorry, I've been away for a few days and you haven't had the opportunity to rehearse that.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The crutches threw me off.

**Mr. Randy Hillier:** Speaker, I seek unanimous consent from the House today for people in the Legislative Assembly, in this chamber, to wear yellow scarves in support of Bill 16 this afternoon.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Unanimous consent has been asked to wear scarves this afternoon. Is there agreement? I heard a no.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### RADON AWARENESS AND PREVENTION ACT, 2012

#### LOI DE 2012 SUR LA SENSIBILISATION AU RADON ET LA PROTECTION CONTRE L'INFILTRATION DE CE GAZ

Mr. Moridi moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 36, An Act to raise awareness about radon, provide for the Ontario Radon Registry and reduce radon levels in dwellings and workplaces / *Projet de loi 36, Loi visant à sensibiliser le public au radon, à prévoir la création du Registre des concentrations de radon en Ontario et à réduire la concentration de ce gaz dans les logements et les lieux de travail.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for a short statement.

1320

**Mr. Reza Moridi:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The bill enacts the Radon Awareness and Prevention Act, 2012, and amends the Building Code Act, 1992, with respect to radon. The act provides for the establishment of the Ontario Radon Registry and requires radon measurement specialists and laboratories to provide the registry with specified information.

The minister is required to educate the public about radon and to encourage homeowners to measure the radon levels in their homes and take remedial actions if necessary. The minister is also required to ensure that the radon level in every provincially-owned dwelling is measured and that remedial action is taken if necessary.

Similarly, owners of enclosed workplaces are required to ensure that the radon level in an enclosed workplace is measured and remedial action is taken if necessary.

The Building Code Act, 1992, is amended to provide authority for regulations that require buildings to be constructed in a way that minimize radon entry and facilitate post-construction radon removal.

The minister is required to review those requirements within five years after the day the Radon Awareness and Prevention Act, 2012, comes into force.

## ONTARIO SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS AMENDMENT ACT, 2012 LOI DE 2012 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LA SOCIÉTÉ DE PROTECTION DES ANIMAUX DE L'ONTARIO

Mr. MacLaren moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 37, An Act to amend the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act / *Projet de loi 37, Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société de protection des animaux de l'Ontario.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for a short statement.

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the OSPCA Act to remove all enforcement powers, the need for enforcement staff, and any fines, penalties, invoicing or bills that the OSPCA has currently been doing. All policing would then be done by the local police force, whether that be the OPP, city police or regional police. The law would be the Criminal Code of Canada that would be used for policing. The Animal Care Review Board would also be removed.

## MOTIONS

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Mr. Speaker, I believe we have unanimous support to put forward a motion without notice regarding private members' public business.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Is there unanimous consent? I heard a no.

**Interjection:** Who said that?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Ask again.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I shall ask again because I didn't want that to interrupt your conversation. Do we have unanimous consent? Agreed. We have unanimous consent.

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** After the scarf issue, I don't know if we should allow that.

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** It's on your behalf.

I move that, during consideration of private members' public business this afternoon, in the event that Bill 17, An Act to Proclaim the Month of May Jewish Heritage Month, receives second reading, the order for third reading shall immediately be called and the question be put immediately without debate or amendment.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Is it agreed for the House? All in favour? Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I'm getting my wording down. Agreed. *Motion agreed to.*

## STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

### QUEEN ELIZABETH II DIAMOND JUBILEE MEDAL

**Hon. Charles Sousa:** I rise in the House today to recognize Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II's Diamond Jubilee. The year 2012 marks the 60th anniversary of the Queen's accession to the throne. This year-long celebration gives Ontarians a chance to look back and thank Her Majesty for her tireless service to Ontario and Canada.

The world has seen dramatic social change in the last 60 years. But our Queen has remained steadfast, a symbol of tradition and stability.

On this occasion, we honour her kindness, her spirit and her tremendous sense of duty. We admire her for guiding the monarchy into the modern world.

To recognize the Diamond Jubilee, the province will award over 2,000 outstanding Ontarians a Diamond Jubilee Medal. These medal recipients are people who have used their time and talents to make our province a better place to live. Mr. Speaker, this is a fitting way to celebrate Her Majesty and the importance she puts on service to others.

Many remarkable Canadians have already received the Diamond Jubilee Medal: musician Gordon Lightfoot for his contribution to the arts; Daryl Fox for his commitment to finding a cure for cancer; and the youngest Canadian to receive this honour, eight-year-old Bryden Hutt for his support of the Children's Wish Foundation.

I invite my honourable colleagues to recognize outstanding members of their communities with this special award. All members of provincial Parliament have received Diamond Jubilee Medals to distribute in their ridings. Mr. Speaker, this ensures that we reach every corner of the province so that we may find and reward those Ontarians who share in the bravery, kindness, commitment and other positive qualities embodied by our Queen.

In fact, all Ontarians will have a chance to nominate members of their community for a Jubilee Medal. Any Ontarian can visit the Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration's website to nominate someone for this medal using an easy online form. The nomination deadline is April 30, 2012.

Mr. Speaker, Her Majesty has said, "In this special year, as I dedicate myself anew to your service, I hope we will all be reminded of the power of togetherness and the convening strength of family, friendship and good neighbourliness." Let us keep Her Majesty's words in mind as we move forward together in 2012. Let those words inspire our actions and let us join with the Queen in her hopes for a better and more prosperous society.

Finally, as we celebrate the Diamond Jubilee, let us reflect on our good fortune to call ourselves Ontarians and Her Majesty our head of state.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Responses?

**Mrs. Jane McKenna:** Thank you to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, who of course had the distinction of being honoured with a Queen's Golden Jubilee Medal in 2003 in recognition of his charitable work in the community. It was well earned, I'm sure. The fact that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is now overseeing the Diamond Jubilee Medal program is one of those delightful plot twists that seem to accompany the royals.

It is my distinct honour to rise today to speak in recognition of the Diamond Jubilee of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, who ascended to the throne 60 years ago this month.

Since that time, she has remained dear to many people around the world. Perhaps no one outside of Britain has cherished her more than Canadians.

The affection is mutual. Her Majesty has praised Canada's values of freedom and fairness, and she has visited here about two dozen times since her teen years, when she toured as a princess. On her first post-coronation visit to Canada in the fall of 1957, Queen Elizabeth had been monarch for five years but was not much older than our current Duchess of Cambridge. Indeed, her star power burned infinitely brighter during her whirlwind tour: Her Majesty would visit again soon after to open the St. Lawrence Seaway, and again a few years later for events marking the centennial of Confederation.

In the summer of 1973, then-Premier Bill Davis and Lieutenant Governor William Ross Macdonald were part of a motorcade that led Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip from Pearson International Airport to Queen's Park. Once again, she was here to celebrate some notable anniversaries, among them the centennial of the RCMP and the 300th anniversary of Kingston.

1330

In the last decade, the Queen's 2002 Royal Jubilee visit made stops in Hamilton, Oakville and Ottawa as well as Toronto, where she visited the CBC to mark the television broadcaster's 50th anniversary. The Queen returned with Prince Philip in 2010 for a visit that concluded at Queen's Park, where they were met by an appreciative crowd on the south grounds. Her Majesty attended the presentation of the Ontario Medals For Good Citizenship and then unveiled a special plaque commemorating Queen's Park's 105th anniversary.

We gather together in this historic building in the midst of a turbulent era—turbulent at home and abroad.

Look at the headlines and you see a world lurching from crisis to crisis. Europe regularly seems to be teetering on the brink of ruin.

It might be helpful to recall how a set of public figures weathered a stormy darkness 72 years ago, how our Queen and her family withstood the Blitz years with grace, grit and a stiff upper lip.

Her Majesty's elegant blend of toughness and poise was bred into her early on. Against the advice of the foreign office, the royal family refused to flee Britain during World War II. The royals stood firm in Buckingham Palace, which absorbed several direct hits from German bombers. The King and Queen were nearly killed one September day when a pair of German bombs tore through Buckingham Palace, prompting the Queen mother's wonderful, no-nonsense response: "I am glad we have been bombed. Now we can look the east end in the eye."

During the Blitz period, the teenage Princesses Elizabeth and Margaret were sent west to Windsor Castle for their safety. A month after that dramatic bombing, 14-year-old Elizabeth took to the airwaves to reach out to the children and youth of the Commonwealth who had been sent abroad for their safety: "I can truthfully say to you all that we children at home are full of cheerfulness and courage," she assured them. "We are trying to do all we can to help our gallant sailors, soldiers and airmen, and we are trying, too, to bear our own share of the danger and sadness of war."

That spirit of solidarity and shared sacrifice appeared again a few years later. It was 65 years ago this month, much to her father's frustration, that Her Majesty joined the women's Auxiliary Territorial Service, where she served as a truck and ambulance driver, always aware of the value of self-reliance and utterly unafraid of manual labour—quite the opposite.

She has also been a compelling voice for peace. Her speech last year at Dublin Castle was a perfect case in point. Looking back over the long and bloody conflict between England and Ireland, she spoke of "the complexity of our history, its many layers and traditions, but also the importance of forbearance and consolation; of being able to bow to the past, but not be bound by it." All of us here might take some of that wisdom to heart.

The Queen is a remarkable woman who has led an extraordinary life, even by the elevated standards of royalty. It is only fitting that we will recognize the occasion of her 60th year on the throne to honour exceptional Ontarians with the Diamond Jubilee Medal. These awards will allow all of the members of the Legislature to remind ourselves of those outstanding citizens who have achieved excellence and demonstrated a commitment to the growth and prosperity of our province. I know that we all look forward to celebrating their stories, even as we honour Her Majesty's 60th anniversary as Queen. God save.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** It is indeed an honour to stand here and talk about the 60th anniversary of Her Majesty's accession to the throne.

You know, in those 60 years, and I'm starting to remember some—most—of those 60 years, a great deal has happened in our world. The technological changes that bring people into your living room every day—never mind your living room, onto your BlackBerry that I often see many members in this House looking at, although they're not supposed to. It can be brought immediately. So if anything happens in the world, instantly, billions of people know about it. In that time, nothing that has happened has diminished the respect people of this country and this province have for the Queen. That cannot be said for many heads of state, that cannot be said for many people in political life, because the foibles of people come and are very transparent today. But throughout even the most difficult of times, the Queen has handled them with grace and with dignity and has set an example, I think, for all of us in public life.

At 85 years of age, she has a stamina that remains undiminished and is actually quite astounding. She has made, as has been said, 23 or 24 trips to Canada alone. She has spent a lifetime speaking to and about and with the people of the Commonwealth, and she has shown us all what it means to be a public servant. In honour of those 60 years, we will be handing out Diamond Jubilee medals.

I remember some 10 years ago, as a relatively new member of provincial Parliament in this place, having the honour to hand out some Golden Jubilee medals in my own riding. Although I had only been there less than a year, it fell upon me and my staff to identify people we could honour. I still remember to this day how moved the people were that they were considered. They were unsung heroes. They were people who had not been hugely recognized. We held a ceremony in this very building, in room 230. We brought in a caterer. We told a story about each one. We pinned the medals on. We took pictures. We made sure that the media knew about it in the riding.

Some of those people—as best I could remember this morning—including Theresa Bowers, for her work as a tenant representative; Grace Stephens and her many years of work around race relations issues; Vi Thompson, whom we honoured for her help in all the things she did for seniors and seniors' organizations; Linda Tournay, for her work as a unionist; Carolyn Lemon for establishing Lemon and Allspice to give adults with developmental disabilities an opportunity to run a business; Doug Taylor, for his work with the Métis community; we honoured Walter and Dylis Jones for their work in Toronto East General Hospital—for more than 30 years, they laboured and continue to labour for that hospital; and John Ridout, who is now deceased but who was the president of the East York Historical Society, who tried to preserve our neighbourhood and all the history that was much beloved by our community. Those were just some of the people.

I'm looking forward to the 14 recipients—we haven't even sat down to determine who they might be. Those are the kinds of heroes that each and every one of us has in

our communities. Those are the kinds of people who need to be recognized.

I would invite all of you, if you have the opportunity and if you're not too far away from this beautiful building, to hold the ceremony here. If your community is too far away, hold it in a city hall or a place of some enormous dignity. Call it a media event. Invite people in. Invite the media. Show them that we have heroes. We have people in our community who give of themselves in the same kind of way that Her Majesty has for the last 65 years, people who put their community first and, above all else, people who deserve the recognition, and people who I am sure will proudly wear this medal for the rest of their lives.

Congratulations to all of us who are going to do this and to Her Majesty on 60 years of service to the people of the world.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I'd like to thank all of the members for their very kind comments about Her Majesty and to bring reference, as a reminder to the members of this place and also to guests, that right downstairs in the main lobby there is a book of good wishes from the people of Ontario. So please feel free to go down and sign the book of good wishes, which will be sent to Her Majesty. Thank you very much.

## PETITIONS

### RURAL SCHOOLS

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** "Petition to Save Duntroon Central Public School and All Other Rural Schools in Clearview Township.

"Whereas Duntroon Central Public School is an important part of Clearview township and the surrounding area; and

"Whereas Duntroon Central Public School is widely recognized for its high educational standards and intimate learning experience; and

"Whereas the frameworks of rural schools are different from urban schools and therefore deserve to be governed by a separate rural school policy; and

1340

"Whereas Dalton McGuinty promised during the 2007 election campaign that he would keep rural schools open when he declared that, 'Rural schools help keep communities strong, which is why we're not only committed to keeping them open—but strengthening them'; and

"Whereas Dalton McGuinty found \$12 million to keep school swimming pools open in Toronto but hasn't found any money to keep rural schools open in Simcoe-Grey;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That Premier Dalton McGuinty and the Minister of Education support the citizens of Clearview township and suspend the Simcoe County District School Board ARC 2010:01 until the province develops a rural school policy

that recognizes the value of schools in the rural communities of Ontario."

Mr. Speaker, I agree with this petition and I will sign it.

### DOG OWNERSHIP

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** This petition is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas currently the law takes the onus off of owners that raise violent dogs by making it appear that violence is a matter of genetics; and

"Whereas the Dog Owners' Liability Act does not clearly define a pit bull, nor is it enforced equally across the province, as pit bulls are not an acknowledged breed;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Legislative Assembly passes Bill 16, the Public Safety Related to Dogs Statute Law Amendment Act, 2011, into law."

I absolutely agree, of course; I co-signed the legislation. I affix my signature.

### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I have a petition here that was sent to me by Shirley Hanlon from Tavistock, Mr. Speaker. It's signed by a great number of people, not only in the riding of Oxford but in the adjoining ridings—in Perth-Wellington and in the Kitchener-Waterloo area. It is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas Tavistock's Bonnie Brae Health Care Centre is an 80-bed, D-class nursing home that must be either rebuilt or closed by July 2014; and

"Whereas there is currently an application by a private operator to move the 80 licensed beds outside of Oxford county to the city of London, despite the recent opening of two other long-term-care homes in Middlesex county in 2010; and

"Whereas long-term-care wait times in Oxford county can be as much as 134 days longer than in Middlesex county; and

"Whereas Tavistock receives referrals from the nearby Waterloo Wellington CCAC, which has among the highest waits for long-term care in the province;

"We, the undersigned, request that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario retain these beds in Tavistock and seek partners to fast-track replacement of the Bonnie Brae as part of Ontario's 10-year plan to modernize 35,000 long-term-care beds."

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for allowing me to present this petition on behalf of my constituents. I will sign it, as I agree with its content.

### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

**Mr. John O'Toole:** It's my distinct pleasure, even though it's out of sequence, to read a petition from the riding of Durham. It reads as follows:

"Whereas citizens are concerned that contaminants in materials used as fill for pits and quarries may endanger water quality and the natural environment of the greenbelt; and

"Whereas the Ministry of the Environment has a responsibility and a duty to protect the sensitive areas of the greenbelt and provincially sensitive wetlands; and

"Whereas the government of Ontario has the lead responsibility to provide the tools to lower-tier governments to plan, protect and enforce clear, effective policies governing the application and permitting process for the placement of fill in abandoned pits and quarries; and

"Whereas this process requires clarification regarding rules respecting what materials may be used to rehabilitate or fill abandoned pits and quarries;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, ask the Minister of the Environment to initiate a moratorium on the clean fill application and permit process on the greenbelt until there are clear rules; and we further ask that the provincial government take all necessary actions to protect our water and prevent contamination of the greenbelt, specifically at 4148 Regional Highway 2, Newcastle, and Lakeridge Road in Durham."

I'm pleased to sign and support this and present it to Rachel, one of the pages here, and support my constituents.

#### DOG OWNERSHIP

**Mr. Randy Hillier:** I have a petition here today—over 4,000 names. The petition reads:

"Whereas currently the law takes the onus off of owners that raise violent dogs by making it appear that violence is a matter of genetics; and

"Whereas the Dog Owners' Liability Act does not clearly define a pit bull, nor is it enforced equally across the province, as pit bulls are not an acknowledged breed;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Legislative Assembly passes Bill 16, Public Safety Related to Dogs Statute Law Amendment Act, 2011, into law."

Speaker, I agree with this petition, I will hand over the 4,000, and in addition, there are over 7,000 online petitions that have also been received.

#### DOG OWNERSHIP

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Mr. Speaker, you'll have heard this before, but I'm going to do it again.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas currently the law takes the onus off of owners that raise violent dogs by making it appear that violence is a matter of genetics; and

"Whereas the Dog Owners' Liability Act does not clearly define a pit bull, nor is it enforced equally across the province, as pit bulls are not an acknowledged breed;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Legislative Assembly pass Bill 16, Public Safety Related to Dogs Statute Law Amendment Act, 2011, into law."

I'm going to give it to our wonderful page Sophia to be delivered to the table.

#### RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** A petition to restore local control:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Dalton McGuinty's Liberal government is forcing Ontario municipalities to build industrial wind and solar power generation facilities without any local say or local approval; and

"Whereas the McGuinty government transferred decision-making power from elected municipal governments to unelected and unaccountable bureaucrats, who are accountable to no one; and

"Whereas the McGuinty government has removed any kind of appeal process for municipalities or for people living in close proximity to these projects; and

"Whereas Tim Hudak, Jim Wilson and the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party have committed to restoring local decision-making powers and to building renewable energy projects only in places where they are welcomed, wanted and at prices Ontario families can afford;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the McGuinty government restore local decision-making powers for renewable energy projects and immediately stop forcing new industrial wind and solar developments on municipalities that have not approved them and whose citizens do not want them in their community."

Mr. Speaker, I agree with this petition and I will sign it.

*Interruption.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** I would just like to welcome the audience and remind you that you're allowed to observe the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly, but you must refrain from clapping and doing any other things. I'd appreciate that.

#### CHILD CARE

**Mr. Rob Leone:** I'm pleased to rise in this House once again to table some more petitions on the child care issue in Waterloo region.

"Whereas the Waterloo Region District School Board (hereinafter 'the board') proposes to implement a before- and after-school child care program in their schools for children ages four to seven years, effective September 2012;

"Whereas the board intends to prohibit all daycare centres currently partnered with schools from continuing to provide the same services;

"Whereas the board intends to charge \$27 per day for the same services that the YWCA charges \$16 per day;

"Whereas the implementation of such a program would result in the loss of revenue for the daycare centres

currently partnered with schools, further resulting in either a fee increase to child care services for children three years and under (\$1,500 plus per month) or the complete closure of child care programs for children three years and under;

"Whereas the result would be to create a crisis in child care for parents in this region who require good-quality, affordable child care for their children three and under, which already suffers from a severe shortage of such services;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Whereas we are seeking that the board either cease to implement such a program or implement a hybrid approach wherein existing daycare centres partnered with schools will be allowed to continue to provide before- and after-school care at rates set by them, and the board may operate before- and after-school care in schools which do not have on-site daycare centres;

"Whereas, should the board refuse to implement either approach,

"We petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to enact legislation amending the Education Act and the Day Nurseries Act so as to protect our valuable and vulnerable child care spaces and affordability from the above actions of the Waterloo Region District School Board."

Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of signatures on these petitions. I'm pleased to sign it and hand them over to page Judy.

1350

## RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr. John O'Toole:** I'm pleased to present a petition not only on behalf of the member from Simcoe-Grey but from the riding of Durham. This petition was presented to me by Clarington Wind Concerns and Heather Rutherford. It reads as follows:

"Whereas Dalton McGuinty's Liberal government is forcing Ontario municipalities to build industrial wind and solar power generation facilities without any local say or local approval; and

"Whereas the McGuinty government transferred decision-making power from elected municipal governments to unelected and unaccountable bureaucrats, who are accountable to no one; and

"Whereas the McGuinty government has removed any kind of appeal process for municipalities or for people living in close proximity to these projects; and

"Whereas Tim Hudak, Jim Wilson," myself "and the Progressive Conservative Party have committed to restoring local decision-making powers and to building renewable energy projects only in places where they are welcomed, wanted and at prices ... families can afford;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the McGuinty government restore local decision-making powers for renewable energy projects and immediately stop forcing new industrial wind and

solar developments on municipalities" and agricultural land that have not been approved "and whose citizens do not want them in their community."

I am pleased to sign and support this petition on behalf of my constituents and present it to Jason, one of the pages.

## TUITION

**Mr. Rob Leone:** I'm pleased to rise in this House to present petitions from students at my alma mater, McMaster University.

"Whereas tuition fees in Ontario have increased by up to 59% since 2006, and students in Ontario pay the highest fees in Canada; and

"Whereas Ontario students owe \$37,000 on average after graduation and collectively owe more than \$7 billion to the federal government and more than \$2 billion to the Ontario government; and

"Whereas tuition fees are the most significant barrier that prevents students from obtaining a post-secondary credential and disproportionately hinders access for students who are low-income, racialized, francophone, aboriginal, queer, transgender or have a disability; and

"Whereas tuition fee increases have enabled successive Ontario governments to remove funding from the post-secondary education sector, leaving Ontario dead last in per-student funding, \$15,000 lower per student than Alberta; and

"Whereas during the 2011 Ontario election, the government was elected in part based on a promise to reduce tuition fees by 30%; and

"Whereas all political parties in Ontario have publicly acknowledged that college and university tuition fees are too high;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, support the Canadian Federation of Students—Ontario's call to drop tuition fees and petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to apply the promised \$430 million in funding for grants to reduce tuition fees for all students and progressively reduce fees by 30% over four years, reduce the debt cap and introduce more student grants rather than loans for students, and increase per-student funding to the national average."

Mr. Speaker, unlike the government, which has proposed several bills of spend, spend spend, Minister—I'd like to present this petition and assign it to Grace.

## DOG OWNERSHIP

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas aggressive dogs are found among all breeds and mixed breeds; and

"Whereas breed-specific legislation has been shown to be an expensive and ineffective approach to dog bite prevention; and

"Whereas problem dog owners are best dealt with through education, training and legislation encouraging responsible behaviour;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To repeal the breed-specific sections of the Dog Owners' Liability Act (2005) and any related acts, and instead implement legislation that encourages responsible ownership of all dog breeds and types."

There are hundreds more signatures, and of course I'm going to sign it myself and give it to Mackenzie to be delivered to the table.

## RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** Mr. Speaker, I have here a petition signed by a great number of my constituents and other good folks in the area. It's to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas Dalton McGuinty's Liberal government is forcing Ontario municipalities to build industrial wind and solar power generation facilities without any local say or local approval; and

"Whereas the McGuinty government transferred decision-making power from elected municipal governments to unelected and unaccountable bureaucrats, who are accountable to no one; and

"Whereas the McGuinty government has removed any kind of appeal process for municipalities or for people living in close proximity to these projects; and

"Whereas Tim Hudak and the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party have committed to restoring local decision-making powers and to building renewable energy projects only in places where they are welcomed, wanted and at prices Ontario families can afford;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the McGuinty government restore local decision-making powers for renewable energy projects and immediately stop forcing new industrial wind and solar developments on municipalities that have not approved them and whose citizens do not want them in their community."

I thank you very much again, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to present this petition, and I sign it, as I agree with the petition.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The time for petitions has come to an end.

I would once again like to remind the audience that we welcome you here to observe the proceedings in the chamber, but I would ask you to refrain from clapping, if you can.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

### CHILDHOOD OBESITY

**Ms. Soo Wong:** I move that, in the opinion of this House, the government of Ontario should create a

childhood obesity awareness month during the month of May as part of its strategy to combat childhood obesity in Ontario.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Pursuant to standing order 98, the member has 12 minutes for her presentation.

**Ms. Soo Wong:** Today, I stand in this House to introduce my private member's resolution, which calls on the government of Ontario to create a childhood obesity awareness month during the month of May as part of its strategy to combat childhood obesity in Ontario.

I'm introducing this resolution after consultation with medical professionals, researchers, educators and young people, through which I was able to learn more about childhood obesity. From those consultations, I can tell you something we have all heard already: Childhood obesity is a growing problem that needs our concern.

Childhood obesity is measured in young people aged two to 17. It can be understood as a preventable condition that occurs when children have an abundance of body fat. Simply, obesity results from an imbalance when energy consumed is greater than that released.

Childhood obesity has become an international crisis. The World Health Organization has stated that childhood obesity is one of the most serious public health challenges of the 21st century. According to estimates, 42 million children globally under five years of age are overweight. In the UK, the latest health survey for England shows that over one in 10 children aged two to 10 are obese. According to the government-commissioned Forsyth report, if no action is taken, 25% of children in the UK will be obese by 2050.

In the United States, childhood obesity rates have nearly tripled over the past 30 years. Today, the Centers for Disease Control states that 17% of American children are obese. In addition, studies have shown that 31.7% are obese or overweight. That means that more than 12 million American children and adolescents are obese and more than 23 million are either obese or overweight.

In Canada, we are facing a similar problem. It is estimated that 26% of our children nationwide are either obese or overweight. In addition, over the past three decades, obesity rates have tripled in children aged 12 to 17 in this country.

Ontario is not immune to this childhood obesity problem. In a 2004 report entitled *Healthy Weights, Healthy Lives*, the then Chief Medical Officer of Health, the late Dr. Sheela Basrur, stated, "An epidemic of overweight and obesity is threatening Ontario's health."

For Ontario, childhood obesity data is limited, but according to Statistics Canada, in 2010, 20% of youth aged 12 to 17 were obese or overweight. It is important to note that this statistic is based on self-reported height and weight data, which tend to underestimate percentages of people who are overweight or obese. Concern over childhood obesity rates has also been voiced in a study by Dr. McCrindle of the Hospital for Sick Children.

1400

Obesity rates among our children are at an unacceptable level. Ontario physicians have warned that if these

current obesity trends continue, we are raising the first generation of children who will not outlive their parents. It is for this reason that we must address the issue.

As a nurse, I can tell you that when unhealthy habits are learned at a young age, they stay with children into their older years. These habits can lead to worse health implications down the road. Evidence has shown that obesity in children contributes to the early onset of type 2 diabetes, heart disease, high blood pressure, chronic joint pain, several types of cancers, and breathing problems such as sleep apnea. These are chronic diseases that will remain with our children as they progress in their lives, preventing our children from living the normal, healthy lives they should.

And because of the associated health risks, obesity has an enormous economic cost on our society. The health impacts related to being overweight or obese cost Ontario \$2.2 billion to \$2.5 billion a year.

Statistics also show that 75% of obese children will be obese as adults. Obesity costs become more expensive as people get older. Considering that over half of Ontario adults are obese or overweight, this province faces a threat of increases in health costs down the line with the high prevalence of childhood obesity in Ontario.

It is for all of these reasons I have mentioned that we need a childhood obesity awareness month. We need a month to educate and inform the public about the need for all of our children to live healthy, active lives. We need to use this month to help alleviate the current crisis and prevent all of our kids from developing unhealthy habits.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my consultations to learn more about childhood obesity, I visited many schools in my riding for a number of childhood obesity and healthy living round tables. A number of schools participated, including Agincourt Collegiate Institute; Sir Alexander Mackenzie—some of my students are here today; Henry Kelsey public school; Dr. Norman Bethune Collegiate; Kennedy Public School; David Lewis Public School; Terry Fox Public School; L'Amoreaux Collegiate; Sir Ernest MacMillan Senior Public School; Stephen Leacock Collegiate; Chester Le public school and St. Henry Catholic School.

The reason why I conducted these round tables was because I wanted to hear from young people who see childhood obesity first-hand or may be experiencing it. I wanted to hear about what they thought about childhood obesity, what are its causes, and how we must deal with this issue. The students provided valuable insight on this issue. They told me that youth today are spending a lot of time watching TV, playing video games and on their computers. Some walk to school, while many do not. Many eat unhealthy food because it is advertised more in the media and is much easier to access. Students also told me that they are dependent on their parents to provide them with healthy foods.

Our kids are more sedentary now than ever before. The Canadian Physical Activity Guidelines suggest that young people age five to 17 should accumulate at least

60 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity daily. However, only 7% of young people attain this level of physical activity, according to the Canadian Health Measures Survey.

Our kids are also eating less healthy. The consumption of high-sodium, fatty foods and high-sugar drinks all play a role in contributing to obesity in children. In a 2009 report by the Heart and Stroke Foundation on the health of Ontario kids, they found that only 13% of Ontario kids age six to 12 eat the recommended five or more servings of fruits and vegetables daily.

We need a childhood obesity awareness month to encourage our kids to be more active and eat healthier. We must use a childhood obesity awareness month to empower our parents to make healthy choices for their kids.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my consultations on childhood obesity, I met with Dr. McVey and Dr. Ferguson at the Hospital for Sick Children. Both doctors emphasized to me the significance of mental health and how it contributes to childhood obesity. Negative body self-imaging and stress at home can contribute to unhealthy eating, binge eating and a lack of self-confidence.

In fact, this point was emphasized by my conversations with students. Stress in a young person's life in school or with their family may lead them to eat unhealthy foods. As well, students who are overweight or obese face bullying, and they are constantly bombarded by the media's portrayal of an ideal body. As a result, those young people lack confidence in their bodies, isolate themselves from others and can suffer from depression.

It is important that we use childhood obesity awareness month to promote positive mental health, confidence and positive self-imaging in all of our children, so our children can have confidence to be healthy.

It is also important that we use childhood obesity awareness month to encourage our schools to teach our kids the importance of living healthy, active lives. In my riding of Scarborough—Agincourt, many parents are new Canadians. They work long hours. As a result, the school is where the kids learn many of their healthy, active-living habits. Because the school plays such a pivotal role, I am proposing that childhood obesity awareness month take place in May. This will give our young people an opportunity to be in school and also enjoy the warm weather of May so that they can be physically active outside.

Many of the schools in my riding are working to promote healthy, active living to our young people. We must also use childhood obesity awareness month to encourage our school boards to continue to motivate our students to live healthy, active lives. The chair of the Toronto District School Board wrote to me and stated that by working together and raising awareness, he believes "we can help encourage physical activity and develop healthy eating habits in children that will last a lifetime."

We should also use childhood obesity awareness month to encourage our businesses, community groups

and sports teams to work in the communities to promote physical activities amongst our youth.

Mr. Speaker, this government has already committed to combatting childhood obesity in Ontario. The Minister of Health and Long-Term Care recently released the Ontario action plan for health care. The government will “aggressively take on the challenge to reduce childhood obesity by 20% over five years.” I fully support this initiative by the minister. My resolution, in creating childhood obesity awareness month, will complement the minister’s objective.

To all members of this Legislature: Childhood obesity is a growing crisis that has an enormous impact on our society, but most of all has an impact on our young people. I hope you will support this resolution so that we can use the month of May to raise awareness about childhood obesity and encourage all of our young people to be healthy and active. What they will learn in the month of May can be used all year around. It is the future of our children and youth that is at stake here.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** Let me offer my congratulations to the member from Scarborough—Agincourt. I thought that was an outstanding presentation that she just made regarding her resolution that, in the opinion of this House, the government of Ontario should create a childhood obesity awareness month during the month of May as part of its strategy to combat childhood obesity in Ontario.

I believe she made some outstanding points about the situation that exists today and also the need for us to support any effort to encourage our young people to develop healthy, active lifestyles.

She has identified the fact that this is a crisis that continues to grow, and I want to emphasize that because, as a former Minister of Health and Minister of Education, and actually a teacher of physical education before that, I certainly am aware of what has been happening during the past few years and have initiated activities myself in order to help combat this. But I really think there is so much more that needs to be done, so I will support the focus during May. I think she has pointed out why that would be a good month to do so.

I think one statement that really hit home to me a number of years ago was the fact that the generation today will not outlive their parents. That is so shocking, when we all take a look at information and we see the fact that—you know what?—people who are aging are living longer than ever before, and yet these young people, if this trend continues, are not going to outlive their parents. It is shocking. It really is incumbent upon all of us to obviously support whatever efforts are necessary to combat this growing crisis of childhood obesity.

I know that the Ontario Medical Association has been expressing their grave concerns, and they’ve also pointed out that the public supports efforts. In fact, they say that 65% of the people in the province believe we should be doing more to combat childhood obesity, and that

includes making investments that are going to translate into results.

**1410**

My colleague has talked about the fact that obesity is a proven risk factor for many ailments and chronic diseases, including hypertension, type 2 diabetes, coronary artery disease and kidney disease, and the list could go on and on. But this also means that not only will the rise in these chronic diseases associated with obesity put new and increased stress on our health system; what really concerns me the most is the impact it is going to have on the quality of life of these young people today who are obese. It’s going to be very different from the life that we enjoy. We’re seeing children today who have heart disease—unbelievable. It’s estimated that the health impact of being overweight or obese is going to cost the health system somewhere between \$2.2 billion and \$2.5 billion per year.

I would say to you that we need to do a couple of things. We need to focus on healthy eating, but we also need to focus on exercise, and we know that children are not getting the exercise today. My colleague has talked about their sedentary lifestyle, and obviously there’s so much more to do.

Now, I’m going to be sharing my time. I’m going to conclude my comments. She’s done a great job; I know my colleagues will pick up where I’ve left off. But, folks, I will be supporting this resolution. We need to act, and we need to act now. With the passage of this resolution, we can celebrate, recognize, in May of this year. Thank you.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** It is my pleasure to add my voice to some of what my colleagues have been saying today. The need for action on childhood obesity is clear. Certainly an awareness month can raise awareness. In and of itself, it’s not going to solve the persistent problem, but it is certainly a step in the right direction that can only do some good. I am hopeful—I would almost say I’m sure—that everybody in this House will recognize that this is a serious issue that deserves this Legislative Assembly’s attention and that this is a motion that is certainly worth supporting.

But I would also like to draw a little bit of attention to: Are we doing enough? Is this action we’re taking today the end of it all? And I’m saying, if this is the case, then we’re falling way short. The statistics have been laid out for all of us to see: 26% of Canadian children between the ages of two and 17 are considered overweight or obese. That’s one in four. And 75% of those kids will grow up to be overweight and obese adults.

But it’s not only a weight problem, is it? When you dig a little bit further, you can’t help but notice that it’s actually clearly linked to lifestyle factors: 26% of overweight and obese children report fewer than seven hours a week of physical activities; 35% report 30 or more hours of screen time. Everybody knows what that is. They go from their DS to their computers to their iPad

to their iPhone to their TV to their computer etc. The ratio is rather startling, isn't it? Less than seven hours of physical activities a week, and that includes everything—that includes walking to school, playing in the backyard, less than seven hours. But screen time, 30 or more hours. I think there are some lifestyle choices that need to be seriously looked at.

We look at eating also. Everybody can see the link between eating and obesity. Only 50% of the kids are meeting the minimum serving of vegetables and fruits per day. That's only one in two that are meeting the minimum standards. For the rest of them, the numbers are through the roof.

I remember in the previous Parliament I brought forward a calorie labelling bill—and I see Dr. Jaczek there remembers. The idea of the bill is very simple: Right now, when you go into a fast food restaurant, you need to either go to the bathroom to look at the big poster or you need to wait to be served and flip over your little placemat thing to see the number of calories in the food that you've just ordered or consumed. What we're trying to do is take those same numbers—the data is already there, available—but put it on the menu board. The way we have it in Ontario right now—the research has been done—one person out of 1,000 uses that information. If you put the calories right there on the menu board, beside Big Macs, \$2.99, 500 calories, one person out of two will use it to make their food choice. I mean, you've already made some food choice; you're already in a fast food restaurant. Maybe not the brightest choice, but once you're there, there are more and more of them that offer other options. But when you don't know and you're not reminded of it, one in 1,000 use it.

If all we were to do is ask them to take that information and put it on the menu boards like all of the states are doing, like half of the countries in Europe are doing, like Australia is doing, if we were to do this, one family out of two, one person out of two would be using it to make healthy choices. In general, they decrease their calorie consumption—so far, the research is just from the state of New York—by 160 calories per order. Take 160 calories and multiply this by the number of times you bring your kids to the fast food restaurant. It adds up, and it adds up pretty quick.

We also have to talk about food insecurity. Unfortunately, the number of families who live with food insecurity—basically, they don't know where their next meal is going to come from. They use food banks and they use all sorts of other meal programs. Eight per cent of Ontarian families use food banks. Where I come from, in northern Ontario, it's 10%: One family out of 10 depends upon food banks. Some of us took the challenge and looked at the type of food you get when you go to the food bank. It is pretty hard to eat according to the food guide when all you have to pick from are all the starches and the cans that come in a box that you get at the food bank.

But there is hope out there. There are opportunities out there. We could do things better, and I'm hoping we do.

Passing the bill, the Healthy Decisions for Healthy Eating Act, would be a step in the right direction. Looking at food insecurity—like the health unit says, put food into the budget—could go a long way toward fighting children's obesity.

My colleague Rosario Marchese had already introduced a bill talking about not targeting advertising at children in school anymore. If you go into a lot of schools, you will still see advertising for fast food, for all sorts of food choices that are not healthy food choices. When you bombard young minds in a place where they feel secure, in a place where you send them to learn and you bombard them with advertising about junk food, it is not surprising to see that they're interested in this.

I see that my time is running short, and I have colleagues that wanted to talk. It will be a pleasure to support this motion, Mr. Speaker.

1420

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Ms. Helena Jaczek:** It certainly is a pleasure to rise in support of the motion before us today brought forward by my colleague the member for Scarborough—Agincourt. I'm going to start off my remarks by telling you a little bit more about our new colleague from Scarborough—Agincourt. She has been my colleague since 1999, when she was hired as a public health nurse at the York region health services department. In fact, she reported directly to me. She was project manager leading our no-smoking bylaw at the regional municipality of York, and I will remember her tenacity and her dedication in that regard. It took us, I believe, some four years, Soo, but we did it, and we had a great celebration when we passed one of the most stringent bylaws in the province at that time.

Now she has turned her attention to this particular public health challenge, which is childhood obesity. As has been pointed out, over one quarter of our children are in fact overweight, and obesity rates have tripled in the past three decades in youth aged 12 to 17. I tried to get some statistics specific, in fact, to York region, and a group there has produced a report, Healthyork, dated 2010. Some of the very alarming statistics that have been compiled there show that among York region residents in 2009—they're starting to measure rates from age 12, so that 5.1% of people aged 12 and over had diabetes. Now, this is at least double from the time I went to medical school many years ago. In addition, some 18.2% had high blood pressure. Again, as the member for Kitchener—Waterloo stated, it's really quite astonishing that we think of children these days with high blood pressure.

In terms of people's attitudes, again, even though the knowledge is out there in terms of the requirement to eat some five to 10 fruit and vegetables per day, in York region only some 47.5% of people are actually doing this. Although we are seeing some gradual increase, it's obviously not nearly what we would like to see.

When we're tackling a problem such as childhood obesity, first of all, it's very important, of course, that

people have knowledge, that they're aware of the issues, that if you consume more calories than you expend every day, you will continue to gain weight, but the crucial link is moving from that knowledge to behaviour change. I think where this particular resolution is going to prove very useful is in bringing attention and hopefully changing actual behaviour.

Now, our government has introduced a number of programs to assist the population in this regard. EatRight Ontario offers free advice on healthy eating from a registered dietician by phone or online. The school food and beverage policy that was previously referenced in fact is banning junk food and trans fats, pop, chips, French fries and candy from schools. We have introduced 20 minutes of physical activity daily for elementary students. There is some progress.

To the member for Nickel Belt, I wanted to let her know that I was actually in the drive-through of a fast food restaurant—I admit it—this last month, and in the car ahead of me, I heard the lady at the wheel demand to know the calorie content of each of the items that she was considering ordering. So even though we didn't get, perhaps, the action that we required through the member for Nickel Belt's private member's bill previously, certainly some of this knowledge and some of this behaviour change in fact is occurring here in this province. I know my colleagues wish to address this issue as well, but I certainly want to congratulate the member for Scarborough—Agincourt in bringing this to our attention.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mrs. Jane McKenna:** I am pleased to speak to the ballot item put forward by the member from Scarborough—Agincourt. I know she shares the Ontario PC Party's heartfelt concern for our children and youth.

In recent years, we as a society have promoted acceptance of various body types, shapes and sizes. That dialogue is important, but it shouldn't distract us from some uncomfortable truths. The odds of our children and youth growing up obese are higher now than they have ever been.

We know that this will have very many serious, even tragic, consequences. Obesity is a proven risk factor for a host of chronic diseases, on top of mental health issues. The impact on our health care system is staggering: over \$2.2 billion a year.

More than a quarter of Canadian children are overweight or obese. Three quarters of those will become obese adults. And nearly a quarter of adults are already obese—a serious challenge, but it is not black and white.

Obesity is a complex issue, and we may not always have all the answers. It might be the result of a passive lifestyle and a low-quality diet, or maybe not. Obesity might be the result of a hereditary disease or a hormone disorder. It could be the result of a life in a low-income household or the upshot of triggers like stress, anxiety and depression. It could be the result of overeating as an attempt to assert control over situations where they feel powerless.

It's never as simple as less food, more fitness. Active lifestyles, physical activity and balanced diets are never the wrong prescription, whatever your body type. But when we're trying to hit on a recipe for changing lives, we should not neglect mental and emotional health. We must all help our young people cultivate self-worth, self-awareness and self-understanding—tools they will need to steady themselves in turbulent times and to lead a rich and satisfying life.

I'm pleased to support, Mr. Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** I'd like to thank the member from Scarborough—Agincourt for bringing forth, once again, this very important issue of child obesity.

Unfortunately, bringing forward a bill that just makes one-month-of-the-year awareness of the issue isn't enough; we actually have to have some action around child obesity.

As my colleague from Nickel Belt already expressed, the NDP have been trying to do that. In the last government, they brought forth a number of initiatives that were not supported by the Liberal government. We spoke out about the issue of adding the HST to fitness programs, which impacts families' ability to actually provide sports and exercise activities for the children. We also tried to work with the government on initiatives to get improvement in health promotion.

I know, as a registered nurse and sitting for eight or nine years, I guess, as a member of a public health board in Niagara, that health funding is less than 1% for health promotion in our municipalities. We also know that outcomes from health care only provide about 25%. The rest of things like social determinants and health promotion make up the other 75%. So it's very important that we support health promotion and take action on these issues.

I was reading an article earlier today. There clearly is a link now between poverty and obesity, not only in children but in adults. I know that, at a local level, many of the programs that are supported from business and from local governments and from charitable agencies to get kids into sport activities and cultural activities, to get them active, are underfunded as well. Many times, the kids only have the opportunity for one year in that program. So if they come from poor families, yes, they may get active for one year, but at the end of that year their family still can't support the activities they need to keep them healthy. Things like competitive swimming cost \$1,000 a year. Things like hockey can cost a couple of thousand dollars a year. So it's more important to ensure that families and the poorer children in our province actually have the opportunity to have healthy foods, that they have enough money to be able to purchase those healthy foods. Certainly I will be supporting this initiative but hope that we can make some amendments to make it stronger.

1430

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mrs. Liz Sandals:** I'm very pleased to be able to stand and support the motion by my colleague the member for Scarborough—Agincourt to create a child obesity awareness month, a month which would be held each May.

As we've heard today already, the World Health Organization has stated that childhood obesity is one of the most serious public health issues of the 21st century. According to their estimate, 42 million children globally under five years of age—that's under five years of age—are already considered to be overweight. In Canada, it's estimated that 26% of our children nationwide are either obese or overweight. That's a tripling of that statistic in the last three decades, so clearly this is an escalating problem.

We know that clearly that's an alarming statistic, particularly because we know from medical research that if a child is overweight early in life, they're likely much later in life to have difficulty with diseases such as heart disease, diabetes, cancer, osteoporosis and a variety of other issues.

Our government has already taken a couple of steps to intervene in this cycle with respect to the whole issue of physical activity. In our first term, we introduced the requirement that for children in elementary schools there be a daily phys ed. program for 20 minutes so that we could make sure that at least with the elementary-aged children they're getting some activity each and every day.

In our last term, we passed a bill called Healthy Foods for Healthy Schools and it did three things. First of all, it banned trans fats from being sold in school—and that's foods that have trans fats in them, obviously—predominantly in school cafeterias, but also things like vending machines and so on. It focused on processed trans fat, because that's where the research shows that the problems are. There are small amounts of naturally occurring trans fats in dairy products and in ruminant meats, and those products are exempted because, as I said, it's the processed trans fats where we have the research that shows that they're problematic.

We've banned junk food from school vending machines. The third point of this was the very important step of setting up more complete nutritional guidelines for foods that are routinely served in schools. Again, that mainly impacts school cafeterias.

Contrary to some of the media hype that you got when this went into effect last fall, it actually is possible to have, for example, trans-fat-free French fries. So you could have French fries that meet the rules, because the issue is about, in many cases, not just the food but how the food is cooked. But we know that's not enough.

We know that there are things that we can do as adults to set the rules in place but there's a much bigger conversation that we need to have with parents, and with teenagers in particular, who control their own diets, about how we lower the intake of foods that are problematic. That's where the member's motion is so important. Because having a childhood obesity awareness month

would enable us to engage parents, children and the larger community in how we prevent this. So I'm certainly supporting the motion.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Rod Jackson:** I commend the member from Scarborough—Agincourt on this issue. It's my pleasure to speak to this today. Obesity affects millions of Canadians. Over the past 24 years alone, the rate of overweight and obesity among Canadian children aged two to 17 has grown from 15% to 26%; it has almost doubled in the past few years. That in itself is a troubling token that we need to take attention of. In Ontario, our population has a rate of overweight and obesity that's higher than the national average too, currently at 28%. Awareness of this growing problem is just the beginning of a much-needed revitalization approach for a healthier lifestyle in our province and, indeed, in our communities.

We're all aware of the negative impacts that child obesity poses in our communities; we see it every day. Weight problems in childhood are likely to persist in children into their adult years. Teenagers who are obese have an 80% chance—an 80% chance—of remaining obese as adults, and this has a terrible burden on our health care system as well.

As our children transition into their adulthood, young adults find themselves developing serious health conditions, as we've heard from other speakers, including type 2 diabetes, which can have dramatic effects on your health peripherally, coronary artery disease and kidney disease, just to name a couple.

The economic repercussions to our health care system are huge and obvious. Especially at a time when we are looking to reduce burdens on our health care system, I think it's incumbent on us to do whatever we can to make sure that we reduce the incidences of childhood obesity, and obesity generally in our community, as those children get older and become adults and have children of their own.

As a parent myself—I have two young children, eight and 10 years old—I'm conscious of my responsibility as a parent and as an adult, with the opportunity I need to present to my children to give them physical activities, things to do, and feed them properly and healthily.

I know that both my young son and my young daughter are heavily involved in hockey, baseball and soccer. But you know what? It's not enough; I'm willing to admit that. They need to do more.

As we get more and more technologically advanced, we find that our kids are becoming less and less physically involved. It's up to us as parents alone to make sure that we rectify that.

Every child in our province should have an equal opportunity to develop and enjoy the active daily routine. This should not be limited, however, only to families who can afford it, nor to one month of the year. This should be something that is ongoing.

Childhood obesity is an ongoing battle that requires the full commitment of every parent and child in our province and our country.

I truly encourage parents and children throughout Ontario to join the debate, get involved in their communities as coaches and teachers, and just involve your kids, even in your own neighbourhood.

Let's use May awareness month as a motivator to make Ontario the fittest province in Canada. Speaker, I pledge support to this motion. I support it, and I will remain committed to promoting an active and healthy lifestyle for all, especially in my community. I'll do my part.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** I see I've got just a minute on the clock. I want to congratulate the member from Scarborough—Agincourt on bringing about this initiative. I think it's important. But, of course, I don't think it will go far enough. We need tangible measures to help our children transition to what it used to be. I can hearken back to my days as a kid, where it wasn't so much organized sports that provided my activity, it was the unorganized sports, the hours upon hours that you spent outside playing road hockey. We need to get kids more active again in schools but also provide them and their families with the socio-economic leverage and ability and freedom to be able to give these kids the ability to get out and get active again.

But I appreciate the effort, and we will be supporting your initiative.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Ms. Tracy MacCharles:** I want to congratulate my colleague from Scarborough—Agincourt for her dedication to children's health, and for the outreach and justifiable support she's received from many fields, most notably in the education and health care sector, including from Chris Bolton, the chair of the Toronto District School Board, who wrote to her expressing complete and utter support for this. So congratulations to my honourable member.

The member herself is the most excellent member to bring this forward, as a nurse and as a teacher in the nursing profession. I can think of no better person to bring this resolution forward. And it's my pleasure to speak to this resolution today as a mother of two young teenagers, also as the parliamentary assistant for children and youth services, and as a volunteer with many children's programs in my riding of Pickering—Scarborough East.

1440

Children and children's health have always been very important to me, and I want to speak to why this resolution is so important in Ontario for all of its citizens and how it complements the many other programs and services our government has delivered for the province of Ontario.

As we all know, nutritious foods help kids learn and help kids get the most out of their school day. As part of the Ontario government poverty reduction strategy, which is very much focused on children, we have in-

vested heavily over the last several years in the school nutrition program that is delivered by schools and community agencies.

When we focus on issues of obesity, I strongly believe the most important thing is to focus on wellness and fitness and less on weight. I hear this from people in my riding. I hear it from dietitians and other experts. As the mum of two young teenagers, I know first-hand the big issue for many children and teens is body image. Diet alone is not the answer to our issues regarding obesity. We know that 87% of Canadian children do not meet physical activity guidelines for the most optimal health and growth.

I am proud that our government has introduced many programs and services that speak to the importance of focusing on wellness and fitness for children and teens. I agree with my colleagues opposite that more can be done, but we do need to recognize—we've made many steps to support a reduction of obesity—why it makes so much sense to support this resolution going forward.

We implemented the children's tax credit to help families offset the costs associated with various sports-related activities. Our government also proudly introduced a healthy food for schools act in 2008, which set nutrition standards for food and beverages sold in schools. We also introduced the health and physical ed. curriculum requirements to provide a minimum of 20 minutes of daily physical activity.

I do want to reinforce my earlier point that the biggest issue, in my view and the view of many others, is body image. Diet alone is not the answer to our issues in solving obesity.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** I'm pleased to take part in this, and I congratulate the member from Scarborough—Agincourt. It would be a bill that I'd be pleased to support. We know that obesity is something that's a crisis in North America. It's not just an Ontario thing; it's not just in Canada; it's a crisis in North America and, indeed, in places throughout the world. And we know that child obesity leads to adult obesity.

I think back to my own youth. I was a fairly active person. I certainly wasn't obese when I was young, and there were very few children who were obese, and look how we've grown up as a generation. We've come to a point, the people of my generation, the people who are—may I say that I'm over 50? There's a lot of obesity.

**Mr. Rob Leone:** You look young, Ted.

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** There's some disbelief in that. But there's a lot of obesity in the over-50, and we were very fit when we were young. Can you imagine what this generation is going to look like when they get to be over 50?

And the problems that we have in our generation—I mean, who amongst us doesn't know the name Lipitor or Crestor? Those are two drugs that we're very familiar with, and they help our generation, but they can only help to a point. If this generation grows up to be anything

worse than we are, as the member for Kitchener pointed out, they won't be outliving their parents, and that's the first time that has happened, I believe, in the history of the world.

So it gives me great pleasure to support this bill and to participate and promote it in May so that we can bring this to the fore and make sure that people understand the crisis situation that we're in—

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Thank you. The member for Scarborough–Agincourt has two minutes to reply.

**Ms. Soo Wong:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank my colleagues from Kitchener–Waterloo, Nickel Belt, Oak Ridges–Markham, Burlington, Welland, Barrie, Essex, Halton, Guelph and Pickering–Scarborough East. Thank you so much for your feedback and suggestions about how to improve this resolution.

The proposed childhood obesity awareness month will not solve or address all the issues associated with childhood obesity, but it will raise awareness and promote and educate about this health and economic issue affecting our young people. The recent Drummond report noted that we need to spend more time to address the areas of disease prevention and health promotion. He also further stated that this province “should do more to reverse the trend in childhood obesity.”

Your support of my resolution today will encourage the health professionals, the educators, the parents, the children, the youth, the business community and the sports teams, coming together to address childhood obesity. More importantly, we are raising a generation—and my colleague from Kitchener–Waterloo reiterated this—of young people who may be dying before their parents. That is totally unacceptable. It is our duty in this House to ensure that we do every measure and every action to promote healthy, active living. The passage of my resolution will not only support healthy, active living, but also healthy eating.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity to address the House.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** We shall take the vote at the end of this particular session.

#### PUBLIC SAFETY RELATED TO DOGS STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 2012

#### LOI DE 2012 MODIFIANT DES LOIS EN CE QUI A TRAIT À LA SÉCURITÉ PUBLIQUE LIÉE AUX CHIENS

Mr. Hillier moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 16, An Act to amend the Animals for Research Act and the Dog Owners' Liability Act with respect to pit bulls / Projet de loi 16, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les animaux destinés à la recherche et la Loi sur la responsabilité des propriétaires de chiens en ce qui a trait aux pit-bulls.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Pursuant to standing order 98, the member has 12 minutes for his presentation.

**Mr. Randy Hillier:** Thank you, Speaker. I first want to thank and congratulate the members from Niagara and Parkdale–High Park for joining with me to sponsor this very important bill today.

I would also like to thank everyone who is here in the galleries today and who have been at the rally earlier today at Queen's Park, in support, again, of this very important bill at Queen's Park. We've had hundreds of people from around the province come here to Queen's Park today. It's unfortunate that we weren't allowed to wear our yellow scarves when we asked for unanimous consent earlier today.

There are a number of flaws in our present legislation that are causing harm and creating injustice with regard to pit bulls and other dogs that share the same appearance as them. This bill seeks to address these flaws.

First off, I should restate the genesis of this bill for the record. In 2005, after a few very high-profile media stories of dog attacks, mostly here in the Toronto area, the Liberal government introduced the Dog Owners' Liability Act, which banned pit bulls. Although the standing committee of the House heard from many, many experts who denounced the premise of the bill, the bill was still passed into law above their concerns and without regard to the scientific evidence. It was clear to everyone that the government of the day felt significant pressure to be seen as doing something, regardless if it was doing the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, good public policy is driven by the interests of our constituents, by science and by evidence, not by media hysteria or bold headlines and slogans. The failings of the Dog Owners' Liability Act are clear.

#### 1450

First, pit bull terriers are not a breed; they are an amalgamation of various dog breeds, and there is no scientific or practical means to determine what is indeed a pit bull. The fact that there is no objective means to classify a dog as a pit bull in the eyes of the law has been used to overturn breed-specific legislation all around the world. This fatal flaw in the breed-specific legislation leaves a dog owner with no recourse against it, with no remedy should a dog catcher state he or she believes the dog is a pit bull. Speaker, a law that provides for no defence, no remedy and no recourse cannot be just, cannot be fair and cannot be reasonable.

This flaw, this denial of basic Canadian justice, of life, liberty and property, has led to the seizure and mortality of thousands of peaceful, loving family pets. Let's make sure we put this into context and use real-life and not just hypothetical examples. People have been out walking their dogs—in this province, in Ontario—on the sidewalk or in the park when suddenly their dog has been seized, taken from their possession and eventually carted off and killed.

There was a case of a young boy who—this was in the UK but with similar legislation—committed suicide

because his dog was seized and destroyed. His dog was neither aggressive nor violent, but it was killed because it looked like it was a pit bull. Speaker and colleagues, law without remedies is not law but tyranny.

Secondly, the law is and has been ineffective. In spite of the pit bull ban, the number of dog bites in Ontario has remained flat, it has remained stagnant. According to the study of the Toronto Humane Society—for the member from Willowdale—whose members are here in attendance today, the number of dog bites in 2005, the year of the Dog Owners' Liability Act, was 5,428. The number in 2010 was 5,345—a difference of 50. The lack of a real reduction in the number of dog bites in the province confirms the evidence of sources as varied as the government of Australia's New South Wales, the University of Manitoba's faculty of medicine, the German veterinary university and the University of British Columbia's animal welfare program in concluding that pit bulls are no more likely to be violent than any other dog.

We ought to be able to see with clarity the folly of this present legislation. Friends, I have known and witnessed far more injuries from cattle and horses than from pit bulls. Ought we to destroy horses and cattle to protect ourselves from that possible injury? I have seen far more injuries from swimming pools, bicycles and hockey than from pit bulls or any other dog. Should we ban those activities as well to safeguard the people of Ontario? The real question and objective of dog legislation ought to be how we punish those people who wilfully pose a threat or a danger to society by either training or creating dogs that pose a real and credible danger to others. There are provisions within this bill to punish those who engage in these harmful activities. I would encourage everyone in this House that reasoned and thoughtful amendments could strengthen those provisions, should the bill be sent to committee.

Sweden has incorporated such provisions that allow the police to seize animals that pose a threat from criminals and other known violent people. Sweden—and the city of Calgary, which has a similar program—has seen a significant drop in the number of dog bites and has penalized irresponsible owners in the process.

Let me end with a few last thoughts. I have two dogs that could be viewed as subject to seizure under the existing Dog Owners' Liability Act. They are my family's pets and have never shown aggression, let alone attacked or bitten anyone. You can ask Christina Blizzard her view, because she came to the house and visited those dogs as well. They've never bitten anyone and never shown any aggression, but should I take them out for a walk in the park, it could prove fatal to the lives of Robbie and Titan.

Lastly, I'd like to read from Hansard and from the words of Dalton McGuinty Sr., who served this Legislature for many years. The following is an excerpt from a statement Dalton McGuinty Sr. made while tabling a petition in this House on December 22, 1987: "There is ... a paw print on this paper"—this petition—

"of one Tory McGuinty, who is the McGuinty family pit bull terrier."

I hope today the Premier—

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** They called their dog "Tory"?

**Mr. Randy Hillier:** Yes. It's in Hansard, December 22, 1987.

I hope today the Premier realizes that his childhood family pet was not a threat to either him or the public.

It's time to put the responsibility on the dog owners, not dogs like Tory McGuinty or Robbie or Titan.

Mr. Speaker, I enjoy this institution immensely, and good public policy is paramount. As you walk from this side of Queen's Park to my offices in the north wing, there is an inscription, and it says: "A place where mind and soul learn freedom's ways." That is a benchmark that was put forward and inscribed in the walls of this Legislature: "Where mind and soul learn freedom's ways."

Mr. Speaker, good public policy requires emotion, it requires compassion, but it also requires reason. That is what is missing in the Dog Owners' Liability Act: reason. It was a bill that was brought forward emotionally and due to media hysteria. I think it's time that we take a step back and reflect on and contemplate the words of our predecessors who came before us and who built this institution. Let us find freedom's ways with a vote on Bill 16. Thank you.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** First and foremost, like my predecessor in this debate, I want to thank everyone who's here representing many different organizations, from the Canadian Kennel Club to the Dog Legislation Council of Canada. Certainly, veterinarian associations have also supported us in this. In fact, I can't think of any organization that really loves animals, that supports animals, that doesn't support us on this. So I want to thank you for all your activism over the last seven years and all your trials and tribulations.

You know, there was this incredible uproar about the death of 100 sled dogs in BC. We all read about that—100 sled dogs euthanized. Yet here we live in a province where, by conservative estimates, thousands of dogs have been euthanized, not because of anything they've done, but simply because of the way they look.

Now, if Ontarians were to truly know these facts—and, trust me, they are beginning to wake up to these facts, judging from the thousands of emails we've received; I think my office gets seven to 10 per day for the last many years that I've been elected—and certainly from the petitions—again, thousands of petitions—that have been signed, and certainly from people in my own constituency who call our office, we know that the word is getting out there. We know that, across Ontario, people are outraged when they actually know the truth behind this bill.

**1500**

Cesar Millan said it best, I think. He said that in the 1970s, they blamed Dobermans. In the 1980s, they

blamed Rottweilers. In the 1990s, they blamed pit bulls and still blame pit bulls. When will they blame humans?

We know that the owners of dangerous dogs are dangerous people. We know that it's the deed; it's not the breed. We know that German shepherds, Labrador retrievers and chihuahuas are as capable of biting. The stats show, in fact, that German shepherds and huskies, for example, are more capable of biting than so-called pit bulls—keeping in mind the reality that there is no such thing as a pit bull.

We know this; these are the facts. These have been borne out by scientific studies around the world, to speak to some of the heckling that came from the member from Willowdale.

One of the expert witnesses, by the way, who actually was used by the McGuinty cabinet and by the then-Attorney General when they first brought in this bill was a city dog catcher in Toledo, Ohio. He was the expert witness. Do you know what happened to him? He got fired. Do you know what happened in Ohio? They overturned the breed-specific ban because it wasn't based on evidence.

Do you know where else they've overturned it? They've overturned it in Banff, Vancouver, New Brunswick—all repealed—Montana, the Netherlands, Scotland, Germany, Italy—that banned, by the way, 90 different breeds—Sweden and, in fact, most of Europe. The UK, Australia and New Zealand are all going through the same process we are here. It's just a matter of time, folks, before this ridiculous and cruel legislation is put to rest around the world. There's no doubt about that.

In fact, I find this a really telling statistic: 12 US states have laws prohibiting breed-specific bans—prohibiting them. That's the situation around the world. Anybody who watched the Westminster dog show, or who loves dog shows—I know we have members here who breed dogs. Whoever watched that show would have seen, paraded around the ring, American pit bulls and American Staffordshire Terriers as champions. Whoever has watched the Dog Whisperer, the most famous dog trainer in the world, will know that Daddy was his dog that trained other dogs and that now, Junior, another so-called pit bull, is training other dogs. He uses them as his go-to dogs for training, the most famous dog trainer in the world—who, by the way, when he came to Toronto, wasn't allowed to bring his dog here for fear the dog would be snatched and euthanized.

You know, it's interesting. When I first introduced this bill, Hershey's law—and I want to say just a word of shout out to Hershey, the therapy dog who can no longer do therapy because, guess what, he meets the definition of a pit bull.

When I first was elected and first introduced this bill, I earned the distinction of having the quote of the year by French CBC, and this is approximately what I said: "The way the bill is crafted by description only"—it says things like "broad shoulders," "short hair," "wide forehead"—"it would describe most of the male members of this House"—except, I said, for the long, skinny tail, and we can't tell that because they wear trousers.

I mean, the average person on the street gets how ridiculous this is. I tell Labrador retriever owners that their dog fits the definition of this bill. Of course, they would never pick on Labrador retrievers because they could prove that they were purebreds. But anything short of a purebred that's not a so-called pit bull look-alike is absolutely at risk.

My dog is at risk. I have an English bull terrier named Victoria. She's the love of our family's life. Now, she's not covered by this bill. "Why not?" I say. Well, Don Cherry has one; maybe that's why not; I don't know. Celebrities have them; maybe we don't go after celebrities.

In fact, that's another interesting aspect of this bill: You don't see them driving through the streets of Rose-dale or Forest Hill, picking dogs out of those people's backyards. You see them targeting those people who can't fight back. That's what they do. They're targeting seniors, new immigrants, people without the financial resources to hire a lawyer to fight this bill. That's a shameful, shameful aspect of this bill, and we know that's the way it's being implemented.

If you're looking at our health, this bill actually threatens the health of Ontarians. Why? Because it focuses on the breed and not on the deed. It ties up our precious animal control services in hauling away innocent dogs because of the way they look and not looking at dogs that aren't so innocent—and the owners, by the way, who are the guiltiest of all. If we want to strengthen dangerous dog legislation—and we do; everyone in this House does—we want to look at ways of getting at the owners and holding them liable for what their dog does, whether it's a chihuahua, a husky, a German shepherd or something that meets the definition of this bill. Hold the owners liable.

The other side of the coin, as you've heard already, is education. We have to educate children and others about how to approach dogs, what to do around dogs. This is what has proven to be effective in every other jurisdiction.

Even the Attorney General, bless his cotton socks, who introduced this bill could not pick a pit bull out of a lineup. We know that because we asked him to, and he picked the wrong dog. The reality is there are very, very few purebred American pit bulls or American Staffordshires anywhere—I think there are about 200 in Ontario—and yet there have been thousands of dogs killed. Who are these dogs? What are these dogs? I'll tell you who they are and what they are: They're dogs whose owners gave up the fight or couldn't afford to fight back. That's the true tragedy. It cost tens of thousands of dollars to hire experts and lawyers to try to prove your dog is not something that fits the bill—which, as I said, just describes every male member of this chamber, not to mention most of our dogs and, by the way, most of the dogs in the shelters.

Thank you, Toronto Humane Society and other humane societies who stood up for animals. If you look through the animals that are there to be adopted, you're

going to see lots of animals that fit the description of this bill. Do we want to euthanize them too? That's sad; that's cruel; that's immoral. That's what this bill is.

How to sum up? It seems like a long time, my friends who are all here; a long time. A lot of money has been spent. A lot of rallies have been gone to. A lot of defences have been entered into. A lot of jurisdictions have gone through this. This has tied up the time and the effort of tens of thousands of people around the world, for a bill—and bills, by the way, that have been rescinded in other jurisdictions, one by one—whose time has simply passed. It was a bill that was brought in because of media hype around a couple of bites. It was a bill that was used in the worst possible political way to pander to the worst possible human instincts. It had nothing to do with the dogs.

If it's your dog—and you know who I'm speaking to out there, because it may be your dog—who's picked up and taken away and you have to fight to get it back or watch it euthanized, my goodness, it ceases to be about this place, it ceases to be about laws, it ceases to be about scientific studies, and it becomes about something far more important, and that is a beloved member of your family, a friend to your children, a comrade in arms; a dog that protects you, loves you, looks after you. It becomes about them, and that's why everyone is here today. Tens of thousands of Ontarians have appealed to their MPPs, to say, "Please do the right thing," because they recognize that this is about their dog. And it could be about your dogs. It could be about the Minister of Education; it could be about her Shar-Pei. It could be about somebody else's mixed breed. If they come for the pit bulls first, they're going to come for the English bull terriers or the bulldogs next, or the German shepherds or the Dobermans. They're going to come for any dog that ever bites anyone and say, "Hah. Look, here we have a danger."

So, my friends, let's start where we are. Let's stop the insanity, let's overturn this bill and let's leave people and their pets in peace, finally, and let these people go back home to pat their dogs and go for a walk. Thank you.

1510

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Kim Craiton:** It's always a pleasure to stand here, particularly on this bill.

I want to say a couple of things before I make my presentation. I didn't have a chance to recognize some people who are here. I want to recognize Greg Benito; his wife, Jennifer; and Jordan, who took the time to come up from Fort Erie. They are avid supporters of pit bulls and dogs across this province.

I also want to recognize Paige Sim and Donna Dempsey, who drove, starting at 4 o'clock this morning, from Ottawa to be here as well. So thank you very much.

I'm really pleased to stand here as one of the co-sponsors of Mr. Hillier's bill, along with Ms. DiNovo. What I'm simply asking for is that this House supports

passage of this bill from second reading to move on to committee.

I want to share with you—some people have asked me, "Well, why?" First, I want to make it perfectly clear: When this bill was being proposed—I'm with the government. I was with the Liberal Party. I was there. I can tell you in all sincerity that the thought in the room when they talked about this was, "How do we protect people?" That's what drove this. The remarks were well spoken about the media really driving it, too, and suggesting that it's the government's responsibility. "You need to find a solution. You need to protect people." That all drove—it doesn't make it right, but that's the background. I'm simply saying, the intent of putting the bill forward was for the right reason, but I didn't agree with it. I didn't vote in favour of it at the time.

So this is not new to me, because I draw from my experiences as a city councillor in Niagara Falls. I chaired the animal bylaw committee that we had there, and we went through this. I remember it like it was yesterday. We had some significant incidents of dog bites, and we as a committee were trying to determine, "What are we going to do as a municipality?" We held public meetings. We had people come to the chamber of council, and it was very emotional. I remember some of the suggestions put on the table about, "Can we ban dogs? How do we deal with owners?" In the conclusion, we made some changes to our bylaw, but the biggest thing that I remember clearly from that whole process was that the public was saying, "Don't look at the dog. Look at the owner. Make the owner accountable." That was the message that I remember clearly, and it always stuck with me. When the legislation was proposed, I thought, "This is like déjà vu for me. I have been through this."

I want to say a couple of things as well. I am just amazed at the number of phone calls, emails and letters that I've received—all of us; I have boxes of them. I took the time—and I don't usually try to call everybody outside my riding of Niagara Falls, Niagara-on-the-Lake and Fort Erie. You can't call everybody in the whole province, but I actually took some time to call some of the people up, whether it was from Sault Ste. Marie or Timmins. I called some of the people up who were very critical of me for supporting this bill. We had a very positive conversation. We didn't sway each other, but I realized that their heart was in the right place, too. Even though they were upset with me, they all agreed that there had to be some legislation to make owners accountable. They didn't disagree with that at all. I'm saying that on both sides of the issue, there is that common feeling: "How do we protect the public and make sure that they're safe?"

The emails and phone calls were amazing. I could probably spend four days reading all the material that we got. But there are a couple of things that I'm going to highlight from some of the emails or letters:

"Finally, some common sense prevails; a heartfelt thank you from a dog lover of all breeds." That was the

interesting thing. All the emails and phone calls came from dog owners of all breeds. It wasn't just people who may own a pit bull or are passionate about them. They were about dog owners who care about dogs. It was irrelevant to them that this was not their dog that we were talking about in the legislation. They just felt strongly that this wasn't the right way to go.

"Thank you so much for your brave, bold and courageous support in joining forces with Randy Hillier and Cheri DiNovo...."

"Thank you for your support. As a pit bull rescuer for many years, I thank you for having the courage and intelligence to fight the travesty that is in Ontario."

"Thank you for co-sponsoring" the bill.

I want to tell you about one situation I even had in my own riding. I actually had a person call me and say, "You passed the legislation, and I'm sure there's a pit bull at my neighbour's house. You're the MPP. I want you to go out and enforce it." Because we didn't have anything to enforce the legislation; we passed it, but we had no standard way of going out throughout all of Ontario ensuring that this legislation is done properly.

I said to the individual, "I'll take a look at it." What am I going to do? I made a few phone calls. I called city hall and said, "Did anybody call you about this situation?" I was telling them what it was for, and one of the councillors I was speaking to said, "You need to know, Kim, what's happening to you is that you're getting pulled into something. The neighbour doesn't like the other neighbour. The neighbour that he doesn't like happens to have a dog and he thinks the dog may look like a pit bull, so he's trying to use you as a way of getting back at his neighbour."

The point I'm simply making is, I found out from across this province that—oh, I can't even imagine the number of people who had their dogs taken away because somebody decided it looked like a pit bull. Somebody just decided. In some municipalities, they didn't have anybody to do it so they relied on a phone call from a neighbour or a private individual saying, "I think that's a pit bull. You've got to go out there and do something." But we never had anything across this province to make sure the legislation was at least done fairly across the board.

I'm standing up simply because I believe in this. It's not about politics. It's not about the Conservatives. It's not about the NDP. I just personally believe and strongly believe that the legislation, well-meaning as it was intended to be, was not the right legislation. What we should have been dealing with is how we make owners of all dogs accountable and responsible. That's what we need to do. So I'm really pleased to be in support of this bill.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mrs. Julia Munro:** I'm very pleased to be able to have the opportunity to speak today in support of Bill 16. It is almost seven years since this government passed the bill we recognize as the pit bull ban.

There are two issues that I wish to focus on in my remarks today. The first is the hearings themselves. I attended every deputation in communities around the province. There was no credible organization supporting the government—not the OSPCA, not the humane society, not the Canadian Kennel Club, not the Ontario Veterinary Medical Association, not the Canada Safety Council—no one, in fact.

It was also brought to our attention by representatives who came from the United States and spoke about the American experience where, at that time in 2005, 13 states had bans specifically prohibiting breed-specific bans.

Today—and the member for Parkdale–High Park mentioned it—the state of Ohio is currently considering the law to remove pit bulls from the definition of "vicious dog" in state law, and it has gone to the governor to sign.

It was during this period of time that I offered the government an alternative to the ban, which was Bill 161. It would come as no surprise to you that they went ahead with their own bill instead. But in 2005, everyone agreed on the necessity of dangerous dog legislation. Everyone opposed a breed-specific ban. And it was regardless of the evidence—the government pursued its plan and passed the bill into an act.

Is it working? Well, you have heard from the member for Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington of the work that the Toronto Humane Society has done and the statistics that it has released. Certainly the kind of change that they are able to show in the numbers is relatively small when we consider the true cost of this bill.

**1520**

That brings me to the second focus of my remarks. It involves the people who have joined us here today, and it involves the people across this province who have been, quite frankly, the victims of the pit bull ban.

Let me take you back to that, seven years ago. People who obey the law, work hard and pay taxes suddenly found themselves on the wrong side of the law. They discovered that their happy, healthy family pet had them on the wrong side of the law. He looked like a pit bull type of dog.

Even then, these owners felt there was a mistake, I can tell you from the conversations I had with so many of you who attended those deputations. They'd come up to me and say, "Well, the government's going to change its mind, after they've listened to all this expert advice, isn't it? Surely, when other jurisdictions have already gone through this experience and discovered that this is the wrong thing to be doing—that it has nothing to do with what the dog looks like—surely they know that they can go online and find other jurisdictions that have excellent vicious dog legislation that works." They couldn't believe that this was happening. These owners felt that there had to be a mistake. How could the government betray them?

After all, since pre-industrial times, people who share the parliamentary tradition that we have know they are

innocent until proven guilty. Little did they know that the fundamental principle of democratic government had been removed in this act. People woke up to a new reality. These families would have to mount a defence to prove that their family pet was not a pit bull type. Untold thousands could not afford to mount a legal defence. Thousands of dogs were euthanized.

This has nothing to do with dangerous dogs. It has everything to do with a political agenda.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. David Zimmer:** I think it's important to look at some of the history leading up to this legislation.

Pre-2005—in the years leading up to 2005—members of this chamber will recall that there was a particularly nasty spate of pit bull attacks on children, on citizens walking in the park and on citizens walking in the street. These were vicious, vicious attacks: children killed, faces ripped off and the like. The member opposite talks about dog bites. In fact, they were vicious, life-threatening attacks.

There was a public outcry to do something about pit bulls. The legislation was brought in. It received second reading here, and it went off to committee.

The member opposite said there were a number of institutions that appeared at the committee hearings, which she attended, and they were opposed to the legislation. I, as the parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General, attended every one of those hearings. There were huge numbers of ordinary citizens coming in off the street in the various communities where the committee had hearings, and to a person, the ordinary, reasonable Ontario citizen said, "Protect us from these vicious pit bull attacks. Protect our children; protect our parents. Make the streets safe; make the parks safe." So we introduced the legislation.

I can say that at the committee we saw medical reports of the results of these attacks. We saw the photographs of what happened to children and senior citizens and young adults who were attacked—horrific, horrific injuries.

Anyway, the legislation passed. And here's how reasonable the legislation is: Really, what it says is, if you've got a pit bull, you've got to have it spayed, neutered, leashed and muzzled. That's all; that's what it says. In return for that, look at the protections that Ontario citizens on the street get. If somebody will merely spay, neuter, leash and muzzle their pit bull, we would be spared from these vicious, vicious life-threatening attacks. That's why, across the board in Ontario, reasonable Ontarians said, "That's a reasonable price to pay in exchange for protection from these kinds of attacks." All we're asking pit bull owners to do is to meet us a part of the way. If you've got a pit bull, spay it, neuter it, keep it on a leash and keep it muzzled. That's a reasonable approach to this issue. For those four things—spay, neuter, leash, muzzle—we protect our families from these vicious pit bull attacks.

That's why, when push came to shove, the average Ontarian out there on the street saw the reasonableness of

the legislation, saw the inherent protections and realized that when the pit bull lobby was attacking the legislation—and the member opposite from Parkdale very subtly, in kind of a sly, sleight-of-hand way, referred to dog bites. There's a big difference between a dog bite and having, as we saw in photographs—we read medical reports of children with their faces torn off; adults, men and women, with their genitalia chewed off. It was vicious—

*Laughter.*

**Mr. David Zimmer:** You laugh; you laugh. But if you go to the reports, the exhibits of the standing committee—

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Order. Order. I would ask the members on this side to keep order, please.

**Mr. David Zimmer:** That's why, notwithstanding everything the pit bull lobby says, the average Ontarian in your ridings, in your communities, supported the legislation, and that's why, when the pit bull lobby took the legislation to the courts to have it overturned—what did the courts say? The courts said that it was reasonable legislation for the harm that it protected from. It only asked for those four simple things: leash, muzzle, spay, neuter.

It's a reasonable piece of legislation given the protections that it provides to the citizens of Ontario, and that's why the ordinary, average citizen supported the legislation.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** I stand in support of Bill 16, the Public Safety Related to Dogs Statute Law Amendment Act, initiated by my colleague Randy Hillier. Even better, this is a tripartisan bill being sponsored by Ms. DiNovo of the third party and Mr. Craiton of the government. So members of all three parties support this bill. It is a good bill which reverses the stereotyping, the breed-specific discrimination against pit bulls that has occurred over the last seven years.

At the core of it, this issue is about responsibility, the responsibility of owning a dog. Whether in the city or the country, dogs are the responsibility of their owners. It is the responsibility of the owner to bring up their dog and treat it with care. Indeed, most dog owners consider their pets as family members.

An owner who treats their dog with meanness will get a mean dog. An owner who treats his dog with kindness and consideration will get a dog with a good nature and a good temperament. This dog will be a safe and enjoyable pet.

1530

Pit bulls are not a pure breed and cannot be identified as such. This is a further reason why this amendment bill should be passed. We can't properly identify the type of dog that is being considered a pit bull. Many dogs have been euthanized by animal control that later were proven

to be of a different breed. This is a cruel and unacceptable result.

I'd like to cite some important information on this issue from around the world and from our backyard. When the German veterinary university studied different breeds of dogs, they found that "pit-bull-type dogs did not show any significant difference as far as aggressive behaviour is concerned." In Australia, the New South Wales government found that American pit bull terriers were responsible for the smallest number of attacks of studied dog types, and "when average severity of bites is considered, American pit bull terriers were sixth of the six breeds studied."

The Centers for Disease Control found that "there is currently no accurate way to identify the number of dogs of a particular breed and consequently no measure to determine what breeds are more likely to bite or kill." The University of Manitoba's faculty of medicine says that only one of 28 media-reported dog attacks causing fatalities between 1990 and 1997 in Canada involved a pit bull breed. Finally, the Toronto Humane Society reports that the number of dog bites in Ontario has not been reduced when comparing the year 2005, when this act came into force, to 2009. So this act has not reduced the prevalence of dog bites in our province.

We know that an abusive dog owner will get a mean dog. We know that a kind dog owner will get a good-natured dog. People should be held responsible for the actions of their dogs.

I support Bill 16, the Public Safety Related to Dogs Statute Law Amendment Act, and I urge you all to do the same.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Steve Clark:** I'm pleased to join the debate today to support my colleagues' Bill 16. I think it's high time that we finally repeal this misguided breed-specific legislation. I am pleased today to be able to talk about some of my constituents. They've sent me numerous emails, and I want to read some of their comments into the record, Speaker, with your indulgence, because I think what they're saying today is very pertinent.

An old friend of mine from Athens, Dan McGivern, has been a breeder of the Staffordshire bull terrier for 30 years. His quote: "I am now looking at my aging dogs and wondering what I will do when my animals born prior to the passing of this ridiculous law die and I'm left to choose another breed to stay within the law. I certainly will give up on breeding, and likely on dog ownership." That's from someone I can't believe would say that, because he's such a dog lover.

Michelle Brew of Brockville contacted me this week to point out that Governor Kasich of Ohio signed a bill on Tuesday that would remove breed-specific language. That state now has legislation that does what we need to do today in Ontario, and that's punish irresponsible owners and violent dogs, not loveable family pets.

Angela Greter of Kemptville offered this hope. She wants "to see Ontario become a world leader introducing

effective legislation that prosecutes the true criminals, the thoughtless dog owners that are allowing or even encouraging their dogs to bite others." I can't agree more with Angela.

Samantha Kutowy of Kemptville was an owner of a pit bull for 12 years that never harmed a human being or another animal in the dog's entire life. Again, she can't believe that we're targeting specific dog breeds.

Jean Dabros of Lansdowne wrote that she lives "in fear of government" because of what could happen to her beloved dog. Terrible.

Melanie Nabert of Oxford Station talks about the discrimination and the fact that we need higher fines and jail time for things like animal cruelty and non-responsible owners.

Finally, I want to go back to the original debate, where my predecessor, now-Senator Runciman, talked about the sensational headlines that put this government into that previous legislation.

I think today we have to look at what's happening in the province. We've got a lot of what you put in to undo. That's a big job for us, to try to undo some of the wrongs.

So you know what? On that side of the House, you're going to get a chance. You're going to get a chance today to do a do-over, and I hope you take that opportunity to do that do-over and repeal this legislation and pass Bill 16.

Thank goodness for the member from Lanark-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington, that he would move across party lines and put this bill forward today. You should all support Bill 16.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member for Lanark-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington, you have two minutes to reply.

**Mr. Randy Hillier:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to indeed thank everybody today for being here. I want to thank my colleagues who have co-sponsored this bill with me. I want to thank all of the thoughtful comments. But I think after hearing—you know, in my presentation I talked about the media hysteria that was generated in 2005. This ought not to be a political or partisan discussion, but that statement by the member from Willowdale demonstrates that he swallowed that sensationalism hook, line and sinker, and he's not been able to get it out since. I have never heard such a ridiculous, unthoughtful, mindless response to a thoughtful bill before this House.

Speaker, let's keep this—I know that there are some who want to sensationalize things; it ought not to be. This needs to be discussed, as it has been by all other members, in a thoughtful way. It needs to be put before this House. We need to bring it forth, pass it today, bring it forward to a committee and have those thoughtful discussions and conversations in the committee, where, indeed, expert evidence can be brought forward once again; that we get right decisions made and that we stop this harmful, unjust activity that's going on of killing thousands of friendly family pets because they might appear to look like some other dog that the member from Willowdale gets shivers over.

Thank you, Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** We will take the vote at the end of the session.

## JEWISH HERITAGE MONTH ACT, 2012

### LOI DE 2012 SUR LE MOIS DU PATRIMOINE JUIF

Mr. Colle moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 17, An Act to proclaim the month of May Jewish Heritage Month / Projet de loi 17, Loi proclamant le mois de mai Mois du patrimoine juif.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Pursuant to standing order 98, the member has 12 minutes for his presentation. Mr. Colle.

**Mr. Mike Colle:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to thank my co-sponsors, the member from Parkdale–High Park and the member from Thornhill, for supporting this initiative. I really appreciate that.

I would also like to thank a number of distinguished guests who are here today. With us today we have Larry Tanenbaum, the chairman of Maple Leaf Sports and Entertainment; we have, from the Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs, Stephen Adler and Howard English; from B'nai Brith Canada, we have Dr. Aubrey Zidenberg and Ruth Klein; from CJPAC, we have Rachel Chertkoff and Tomer Chervinsky; from the Friends of Simon Wiesenthal Centre for Holocaust Studies, we have Avi Benlolo and Stacey Starkman; from the UJA of greater Toronto, we have Jeff Springer; from the Jewish Family Institute, we have Ellie Bass; from the Toronto Jewish Music Week festival, we have Judy Jacobs; and we also have Bernie Farber, Karen Mock, Howard Brown, and Roz Lofsky. Thank you for being here.

I just want to read into the record that, hopefully, with this proclamation of May as Jewish Heritage Month, we can acknowledge and honour all Jewish Ontarians who, through their everyday actions, work to provide a better life for future generations by joining hands with all who seek equality and opportunity. In this month, may we recall that the history and unique identity of Jewish Ontarians is part of the grand narrative of our province, forged in friendships and shared wisdom between people of all faiths.

1540

Mr. Speaker, with this bill, we have an opportunity really to recognize the pioneers of Ontario who, over the last 200 years, have helped build this great province, from Kenora to Cornwall, and hopefully the passage of this bill will give all of us an opportunity, Jews and non-Jews, to recognize and celebrate in this great part of Ontario's heritage.

We have chosen the month of May because there are many significant events that occur in the month of May. There's the UJA Walk With Israel that occurs in May; B'nai Brith Canada has its annual policy conference; the Friends of Simon Wiesenthal Centre Spirit of Hope benefit takes place; there's the Holocaust Remembrance Day that takes place, according to the calendar; Israel

Independence Day is celebrated; the Jewish Film Festival takes place during that month; Jewish Music Week is celebrated; and also, in the United States of America, various presidents, from George W. Bush to President Obama, have proclaimed May to be Jewish American Heritage Month.

As many of us know, in all of our communities, we have incredible pioneers, and I hope that this month will give us an opportunity to recognize the pioneers that come from the Jewish faith. They live in communities small and large. It goes back over 200 years, and they lived and worked in small communities, from Bancroft to Hamilton. In fact, 60% of all Jewish Canadians live in our province, and there have been many important Jewish Ontarians who grew up outside of the big city of Toronto. Broadcaster and trailblazer Barbara Frum was from Niagara Falls, and we all know her great contributions to broadcasting. Isaac Waterman from London, Ontario, founded Imperial Oil in 1880. Senator David Croll was the mayor of Windsor, and he became a Senator in Ottawa. Bora Laskin was born in Thunder Bay and became the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. Fanny Bobbie Rosenfeld grew up in Barrie, and she was named Canada's athlete of the half-century and won medals in both the Summer Olympics and Winter Olympics. Justice Michael Moldaver, who was just named to the Supreme Court of Canada, hails from Peterborough.

There are so many individuals who have contributed in their own communities to build a better Ontario. Their names are too countless to refer to, but I'm going to try and refer to some of them who have made a real difference in this incredible province.

If you look in theatre, there are people like Eugene Levy, who used to live just up the street here on Avenue Road, in fact; Howie Mandel; Honest Ed Mirvish—what he did for theatre in Canada and the world; the singer Amy Sky; Wayne and Shuster; and Celia Franca, founder of the National Ballet of Canada.

In the field of law, there are just so many numerous incredible contributors who have helped to make incredible contributions. One gentleman who deserves recognition is Abraham Lief. Justice Lief, actually, is the father of Ontario family law. And there's the honourable Sidney Linden.

We've had great political leaders like Nathan Phillips, who was from Brockville, Ontario. We had Phil Givens, mayor of Toronto. We've had Mel Lastman. We've had Paul Godfrey as Metro chairman, who is now publisher of the National Post, and who was an incredible leader here in the city of Toronto and the province. These are some of the people who have contributed a great deal.

I wanted to mention two individuals that have quite a unique contribution, I thought, and are typical of the incredible spirit and tenacity of Ontarians of Jewish heritage. One is David Goldberg from Hamilton. He was a Royal Canadian Air Force fighter pilot in World War II.

Talk about tenacity. David Goldberg was shot down in France. He avoided capture. He literally walked all the

way through France with the help of the French underground; walked through Spain, the Pyrenees, and ended up back in England. A month later, what did David Goldberg do? He volunteered again, went back to the front and continued to fight for democracy and freedom.

David Goldberg flew 235 missions as a fighter pilot. Then he came back to Hamilton, went to Osgoode Law School, became an outstanding lawyer, practised law and was a full-time reservist while he was practising law. So David Goldberg is typical of the incredible tenacity and the generosity of our Canadians of Jewish heritage.

Another interesting story is the story of the Green family. Lipa Green—the father of sons Harold and Al Green—started with his sons as chimney sweepers and cleaners. They used to sweep and clean chimneys. From sweeping and cleaning chimneys, they started repairing chimneys. From that they went on, with the bricks they were accumulating from repairing chimneys, to building houses. They went on to become founders of one of the largest construction development companies in Canada, the Greenwin firm, which has built housing all over Ontario. In fact, the Green family is also known for their incredible philanthropy to the arts, to sculpture, to the Reena Foundation. They're an incredibly philanthropic family.

Or I could mention the family of Larry Tanenbaum, whose father, Abraham, came by ship from Poland in 1912 and started acquiring scrap metal. From scrap metal he eventually created one of Canada's most formidable construction companies.

These are the people in the Jewish community who helped build this country and are still building this country. Whether they be architects like Jack Diamond, or the wonderful contributors to the arts; whether it be the philanthropy of the Sonshine family; Peter Munk, the industrialist and entrepreneur; Murray Koffler and the incredible contributions that he made; the Tanenbaum family; Joseph Rotman; Seymour Schulich—all these people were builders, entrepreneurs, risk-takers, pioneers, and always generous and always very, very proud of their Jewish roots and loving of their Canadian roots.

They have left marks that are still with us today. If you look at Holy Blossom synagogue, a beautiful work of architecture up Bathurst; Beth Tzedec; the Kiever Shul in Kensington Market, one of the oldest shuls. I know there's also what they call the Parkdale shul, the Junction Shul—beautiful works of architecture.

There's also the influence they've had on our cuisine, our food, our music. Oddly enough, this year, the United Bakers Dairy Restaurant in my riding is celebrating their 100th anniversary. The Ladovsky family has been operating this bakery in Toronto for over 100 years, and this May they will be celebrating that centenary. Mazel tov to the Ladovsky family.

Mr. Speaker, I've just given you a snapshot of the incredible diversity, generosity, loyalty—in fact, in World War II, over 16,000 young Jewish men volunteered to fight for Canada. Over 30% of the population of Jewish males over the age of 21 volunteered to fight for

Canada, and they served this country well in time of war and they served this country well in time of peace.

**1550**

I just hope that with the passage of this bill, we can recognize the contributions not only of those who are well known and have made contributions but all the unsung heroes who have made Ontario their home and have, over the last 200 years, really made a difference and really contributed to making this the great province and the great country that it is.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** What a great day this is for Ontario. High time that we did this, so I rise today to join my colleagues in support of Bill 17, An Act to proclaim the month of May Jewish Heritage Month.

Before I go any further, I'd like to pay special tribute to my colleague the member for Eglinton–Lawrence for coming up with this idea and for inviting myself and the member for Parkdale–High Park to co-sponsor the bill with him. It's a genuine display of non-partisanship and something that is long overdue in our province.

Thornhill, which of course I represent, has the largest Jewish population in the province of Ontario—at last count, something like 60 synagogues in Thornhill alone, and probably 10 more since I did that count.

People often wonder about us, about us as a community, a community that has been around in one form or another for many thousands of years. For example, here in Ontario, people will often ask, "Why are so many of you professionals? Why do so many of you own businesses?" The answer is actually quite simple. It's because, in the early 19th century, when Jewish immigrants started to arrive in the province of Ontario, they couldn't get jobs in the big corporate set-ups that existed at the time, so they had to go on the necessity-being-the-mother-of-invention idea and invent jobs. Inventing a job meant you either became a professional or you started a business, and some of these things survive today.

Of course, we've gotten past the days where there are corporate barriers to Jewish people, and, for that matter, any other people in this wonderful diverse province that we have.

That's part of the history, and that's one of the things that we can expose when we introduce Bill 17 and wind up with a law that creates Jewish Heritage Month. Bill 17 is precisely about that. It's about recognizing Jewish Ontarians and their many contributions to our province's history. Ontario was founded by new Canadians, who took it upon themselves to build a great province, and indeed, that's what we have in Ontario.

The first Jewish immigrants, as I mentioned, struggled when they arrived in the early part of the 19th century. They established their small businesses to support themselves and their families. My colleague from Eglinton–Lawrence has very well enunciated the same list of people that I have here, who are great contributors from the community.

I might add, in medicine, Dr. Rena Buckstein in haematology and Dr. A.I. Wolinsky in anaesthesiology;

in business, Peter Munk, the founder and chairman of Barrick Gold; Joseph Rotman, of Clairvest; Heather Reisman, founder and CEO of Indigo Books—the list goes on and on.

In sports, you mentioned Mr. Tanenbaum, who's with us today—go, Leafs, go!—and Dan Shulman of TSN and ESPN. There are just so many.

Institutions founded by the Jewish community to help serve the growing immigrant population of Ontario—and this again may surprise some people—Mount Sinai Hospital was founded originally to serve Toronto's poor, Yiddish-speaking immigrant population. Can you imagine that beautiful edifice on University Avenue starting that way? It welcomed Jewish doctors and medical interns, who were often rejected by other institutions back in the day. Mount Sinai has grown, of course, into one of North America's top teaching, research and medical institutions.

Baycrest hospital and home for the aged was founded by the Ezras Noshem Society, which was a charitable women's group, to care for the elderly. This facility, too, has grown into one of Canada's leading institutions in aging and brain health research and innovation.

May, as Mr. Colle of Eglinton-Lawrence has duly noted, is a really important month. It's when we mark Holocaust Remembrance Day, or Yom ha-Shoah, when we remember those who were lost in that tragedy; Israeli Independence Day, or Yom Ha'atzmaut, marking Israel's declaration of independence; a UJA walk for Israel, which raises money and awareness for the cause of Israel, so well represented in Canada by our Prime Minister, Stephen Harper; the Jewish film festival; and Jewish Music Week. It is fitting that May be the month designated as Jewish Heritage Month.

In conclusion, this bill has received the endorsement of prominent members of the Jewish community, many of whom are represented here today—organizations as well as individuals. Interestingly, it's also endorsed by the National Congress of Italian Canadians for whom we—I was involved in this as well—helped pass Italian Heritage Month for another great builder group in the province of Ontario last year.

Hundreds of communities have helped build this province. Bills like Bill 17 help us, as Ontarians, to illustrate and recognize these contributions, and I urge all of my parliamentary colleagues to join me in support of Bill 17 and see to its speedy passage here today.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** It's a pleasure and a privilege to rise and speak to this bill. I welcome our guests here, as have been welcomed before.

At the risk of breaching some protocol here, I just want to show that in my riding, the Junction Shul just celebrated its 100th anniversary. I was there to celebrate that. It was a joyous, joyous occasion. I found myself talking to this delightful gentleman in his 80s—I didn't know who he was—and he was talking about his own particular history.

He was talking about how his family came to the Junction when the Junction was a very poor, very Jewish area prior to World War I and how he got involved in the scrap metal business—this was his grandfather Abraham—and how he was one of the founders of the Junction Shul, and then how the sons went into the business. I said, “So, are you still in the business?” He said, “No, no, I moved from that into other things.”

I discovered later that the gentleman I was speaking to was Joey Tanenbaum. I discovered at that point also that he was the gentleman who was gracious enough not only to have kept, in part, the Junction Shul alive, but also to provide the wonderful scotch for the l'chaim party after the celebration of the Junction Shul.

My history is interwoven with Jewish Heritage Month in the sense that I grew up in a very Jewish neighbourhood. People say, “Where was that?” I say, “The Annex.” I grew up in the Annex and just to the south of me was Spadina Avenue, which was all Jewish back then, and Kensington Market, which was all Jewish back then. In fact, Huron Street public school was an interesting mix between Italians and Jews. That was the Annex and that was Spadina and Kensington Market.

I went to all my friends' bar mitzvahs. I don't remember bat mitzvahs back then, but the bar mitzvahs weren't anything like the bar mitzvahs my children have gone to. They were usually held around the kitchen tables. They were held just with the family—very, very different times but all part of Jewish Heritage Month.

I also want to bring attention to some of the incredible history of Jews in Canada, which I don't think anybody really knows, that's not part of the community, and that is, that their contributions go way back to the 18th century. In fact, the first Jew we have on record who emigrated here came back in 1738 and went to French Canada back then. Of course, it was totally different. She snuck in dressed as a man. The feminist in me loves this story. She snuck in dressed as a man and she was deported because she wouldn't convert to Catholicism—very cool—and then, of course, proceeded to come in more and more after that.

And another stat, too, which I love to share is that B'nai Brith was founded in 1875. Most people don't know that, either, and I think these are facts we should celebrate. This is how far back the history goes.

Of course, it's not always bright, and part of this—and I think the member from Thornhill alluded to this—is that we, as Canadians and Ontarians, have to share the dark side of how Jewish immigrants were treated here as well. I grew up with my father, who was of course not Jewish—Italian-Canadian Catholic—talking about the race riots in Christie Pits when Nazis would beat up Jews. I grew up with stories about how horrible it was that out in the Beach—the member from the Beaches here—on the boardwalk it said, “No Jews or dogs allowed,” and that was within memory.

I grew up with the story told to me by my family about how Canada turned away the vast majority of Jewish immigrants who wanted to emigrate here between 1930

and 1939. I think we accepted 4,000 out of 800,000. So we need to remember the dark background, to remember that we need to celebrate what has been accomplished since then, and despite that. These accomplishments have been done despite that.

1600

Again, it's interesting: The member from Thornhill mentions the legal profession and the professions where Jewish immigrants have excelled, but in fact, they weren't allowed in to study in those professions for most of the history of their immigration here. There were quotas in government, too. The city of Toronto had quotas and would not allow Jews to be policemen or work for the transit system. That's all part of the backdrop of the celebration that we need to remember, because we remember that this was all overcome as part of it, and that it was, of course, completely legal not to hire somebody or rent to somebody because they were Jewish. All of that is part of the background, which continues today, by the way. There are still horrendous acts of anti-Semitism that go on. So that's the background.

The foreground, however, of this bill is celebration. It's celebrating the great accomplishments and, of course, all that continues to be accomplished, too.

Another intersection of my life and this story is that one of the first times I ever interacted in a political context was when I got invited to have lunch with the mayor. I think I was eight years old at that time, and it was because I took part—completely innocently; I didn't realize I had. Photographers came to our schoolyard and took a picture of me with my best friend, who happened to be a Jamaican Canadian—one of the first, actually, in our school, the only young black woman in our school. I was pretty fair, and there's a picture of me and her whispering to each other; it was for the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews. I still have that poster. It's framed in my office here at Queen's Park, if you ever want to look at it.

So again, a forefront agency that worked to overcome racism, overcome stigmatism, overcome oppression, and again, really an institution that was founded by Jewish immigrants and their descendants.

I'm going to leave some time for my colleague. In fact, what was really interesting is we were kind of jostling for time. We both wanted to speak to this bill, so that in itself says something. We're excited about it; we're excited about the celebrations that are going to happen in May, we hope, and we're excited about being able to share all of this experience with everyone out there.

I also just want to close by saying that if you ever come to Parkdale—High Park, you have to go to 56 Maria Street in the Junction and go to the Junction Shul. One of the delightful things about the Junction Shul is that it had a rabbi for only a very short period of its history. It has been led by the congregants. They only come together now to worship for High Holidays, but it's the oldest synagogue that has been in continuous service, at least

for High Holidays, in Ontario. And I'm the beneficiary, having it in my riding. Its doors tend to not always be open, but if you give me a shout, I'm happy and they're happy to take you on a tour of it, because it truly is a landmark. It's truly beautiful—some of the most beautiful art, lovingly preserved by the founding families of that shul, and brought together in a wonderful book.

This is part of our heritage, this is part of the Jewish heritage, and this will become part of Jewish Heritage Month. Thank you.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Thank you. Further debate?

**Mr. Paul Miller:** I too will join in this conversation and am very proud to be part of it. I'm from the Hamilton area and we have a very proud Jewish community in our city. They have contributed over many decades to our city, building industry and business, and also take an active part in our community on many, many levels—in sports, in arts and music; they have been a major contributor to the landscape of Hamilton.

I also can say that I married into a Jewish family; I married into the Paikin family, and my lovely wife and I have spent many years together. I'm quite proud of her heritage, and I being Scottish, she's taken quite an interest in my heritage too. So we've shared some wonderful stories and have gone over a lot of colourful maps, and we have some destinations we'd like to visit. I certainly would love to go to the Holy Land one day with her and partake in some of the traditions and the wonderful culture.

The Jewish community has had many, many, many hills to climb over the years, and they've stuck it out. They've been brave troopers and they have overcome many, many setbacks to become a major part of the Canadian landscape.

I, too, as Cheri DiNovo spoke of, have had many friends in the community. I've worked with them in the steel mills. I've played sports with them, and many of them have become close friends. People, in general, share more in common than a lot of us would like to admit. I'll tell you, it has been a character builder for me. It certainly has made me proud to be part of their community and part of their heritage, as well as—they actually have open arms. The rabbi that my wife had, Rabbi Baskin, was a very—how would I put it? I don't like to use the word "liberal." I don't want to give you guys any credit, but he was a very liberal type. He certainly was open to all other faiths, and he was very, very co-operative in our community. He supported and got very active in the politics in our community. At every function for mayors or in elections, he was involved heavily and spoke at many of the community events. He was well-spoken, well-read and a tremendous, tremendous guy. We really appreciated his contribution to our community. Rabbi Baskin will always be remembered for his contributions to the Hamilton scene.

I can leave a little time for Cheri to finish off, because she did such a great job and I'm actually running out of steam here.

I just want to say congratulations. It's long overdue. Let's hope that we can open some more doors that have been shut for many years.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Hon. Eric Hoskins:** I want to first thank MPP Colle for introducing this important bill, but also the two co-sponsors: MPPs DiNovo and Shurman.

I am honoured to rise in the House today to offer my support and, frankly, my admiration for all that Ontario's Jewish community has accomplished and all that lies ahead.

It's right that we as a Legislature, as elected officials and as citizens of this great province should recognize the month of May as Jewish Heritage Month, because in celebrating the Jewish community, we celebrate a community of citizens whose achievements and successes serve as a model for how we all can contribute to civic life in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I'm blessed to represent the great riding of St. Paul's, and in my riding—we have nothing close to MPP Shurman's count—we have five synagogues: Beth Tzedec, Beth Sholom, Forest Hill Jewish Centre, the Chabad of Midtown, and Holy Blossom Temple.

Two weeks ago, the Jewish community in St. Paul's, and at Holy Blossom in particular, lost one of its most treasured members. Rabbi Gunther Plaut lived a storied life. He was a dedicated teacher and scholar. After fleeing Germany to escape the horrors of the Nazis, he became a tireless defender of human rights, of pluralism and of openness. Like the rabbis in attendance today from my constituency and beyond its borders, and like the Jewish community as a whole, he reached beyond his faith community to lift us all up.

That act of reaching out is a quality that I believe defines the Jewish community here in Ontario, through individuals but also through organizations like the United Jewish Appeal, the Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs, the Canadian Jewish Political Affairs Committee, the Friends of Simon Wiesenthal Center for Holocaust Studies, B'nai Brith, all of whom have representatives here today, and so many others.

The Jewish community has reached out and has established itself as an indispensable part of our larger community, to the point that your heritage is our heritage. As Ontarians and as Canadians, your achievements are successes that we celebrate together. Your history and your heritage is one that we are inspired by together.

One of the greatest honours that I have had as an MPP was to participate last year, for the second time, in a ceremony on May 19 of last year, with Premier McGuinty, the Canadian Society for Yad Vashem and 19 survivors of the Holocaust. These 19 men and women, these survivors, carry your history and your heritage within themselves. By their very presence, by their act of survival, they taught me so much about resilience, about what it means not just to carry on in the face of unspeakable, unimaginable tragedy, but to never forget—and most of all, to build. Through the numerous events

I've had the privilege to attend, even in just the last year, I've seen the strength of the community that you've built together.

**1610**

Here in Ontario our Jewish community has achieved so much, overcome so much and built so much. This bill is a small act of recognition for all that you have contributed to this great province and this country.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mrs. Christine Elliott:** I am very pleased to have this opportunity to speak in support of Bill 17, a bill proposing that the month of May be recognized as Jewish Heritage Month in Ontario. I'd also like to welcome our guests to the gallery today.

I'd like to start by applauding the member from Eglinton—Lawrence for bringing this important bill forward, and my colleagues the members from Thornhill and Parkdale—High Park for agreeing to co-sponsor it.

The Jewish community's rich contribution to Canadian culture, science, business and innovation has done much to enhance the fabric of our multicultural society. From medicine to law, politics to philanthropy, it's hard to think of a professional field that has not been positively impacted by the Jewish community.

It is so fitting that the month of May has been chosen as the month to recognize Jewish heritage, because among other important events, May also marks Holocaust Remembrance Day and Israel Independence Day.

Jewish Heritage Month would also give us the opportunity to recognize the phenomenal contributions many Jewish Canadians have made to our province. Rather than mentioning the many names that have already been mentioned by many of my colleagues, I'd like to recognize a particular field that I think many members of Canada's Jewish community have made a significant impact on, and that's in the area of business, particularly the area of business innovation.

As we know, we're facing very difficult economic times here in Ontario, and I think we need to look elsewhere for some inspiration. We have a significant innovation gap here in Ontario which affects our productivity and our ability to compete on the world stage. It's so fitting that so many Jewish Canadians have stepped up to the plate to make connections with Israel to form some partnerships—places that we can learn from.

Israel is well known as an innovation incubator, as a start-up nation, and there have been some very positive connections that have been made with the assistance of many members of the Jewish community, with both the federal government and the provincial government, particularly in the area of brain research, which is going on now. There are many other opportunities.

I would say that I recently had the opportunity to visit Israel several weeks ago and had the opportunity to visit Technion, the Israel Institute of Technology, and the Weizmann Institute of Science. There's some wonderful work that's being done there that we could truly learn from.

So I want to celebrate that, particularly today. There's much we can learn here in Ontario, much that we can work on together so that we will have so much to celebrate and to be grateful for during the month of May.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** I want, in this brief minute, to express my support for Bill 17. I want to say, as an Italian Canadian, that the Jews and the Italians have grown up together in the area of Trinity–Spadina and have moved along Bathurst, where the Jewish community is on the eastern part of Bathurst and the Italian community is on the western part, all the way from the lake up to Thornhill and beyond. It's quite a fascinating history that we share together.

The other little history I want to share is that my wife, who happens to be Chilean, is half Jewish, so it seems that the Italians and the Jews are connected in that way as well.

And in this brief 20 seconds I want to express my admiration to the Jewish community as a whole in two areas in particular; that is, the incredible commitment they have to anti-racism and human rights. That is something that I attribute to them as a community, and I wanted to express that in the brief minute that I have.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Monte Kwinter:** I'm delighted to rise today in support of Bill 17.

In 1760, General Amherst, who captured Montreal for the British, had Jews in his regiment, including four officers who were Jews. The most prominent was Lieutenant Aaron Hart. After his service, he settled in Quebec. One of his sons was elected to the Legislature of Lower Canada on April 11, 1807, becoming the first Jew in an official opposition in the British Empire. At his swearing-in, he took his oath on a Hebrew Bible, which so enraged the Catholic population that he was expelled from the Legislature. The Legislature dismissed him in 1808 and 1809. He was re-elected again, but Jews were not allowed to hold elected office in Canada until a generation later.

This discrimination continued in various forms for many years. I'm old enough to remember where there were restrictive practices at clubs, resorts and workplaces, just to name a few, and I lived through that. There was no discrimination against me, but when I graduated from university, my first job, as an industrial designer, was with Dunlop Rubber. The most common comment I got from my Jewish friends: "How did a Jew get hired by Dunlop Rubber?" There was a perception that these corporations—not a perception, a reality—were not hiring.

Since these early days, the Jewish community has grown, prospered and participated fully in the life and culture of Ontario. Almost 20,000 Jewish Canadians volunteered to fight for Canada during the Second World War. This was the largest percentage of participation by any ethnic community.

After the war, roughly 40,000 Holocaust survivors came to Canada, settling mostly in Montreal and Toronto. I had the honour 18 years ago of participating in the first honouring of individual Holocaust survivors in the Legislature for their outstanding contribution to Ontario.

Today, we are acknowledging the significant contributions made by the Jewish community in the fields of medicine, law, politics, art, business and philanthropy. I want to add another interesting irony: In the early 1980s, I was the chairman of the Toronto Harbour Commission. One of the big issues of the day was that the harbour police and the port police were being duplicated by the Toronto police, and there was a huge issue in the community because of the expense. Over the years, there could never be a resolution. So on a particular day, I sat down with two of my friends: Paul Godfrey, who was the chairman of Metro at the time; Phil Givens, the previous mayor, who is now the chairman of the police commission; and Monte Kwinter, the chairman of the harbour commission, and we ironed out a deal that put this particular problem at rest.

The greater irony is that it took place in a building that even then was not allowing any Jews to be members. Here we were talking about it, and we said to each other, "If only our forefathers could see us now. Here we are solving this problem."

Of course, since that time, things have improved, but as Cheri has said, there is still latent anti-Semitism out there. This particular bill is going to do a great deal toward bringing the general community together as we celebrate Jewish Heritage Month in May.

I am delighted to support it, and I hope that all of us will continue to support it. Thank you.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** I'm very pleased to take part in today's events. The only surprise that I have today is that there isn't already a Jewish Heritage Month in Ontario, as they have been such an integral part of our community and our province for so long.

I was very pleased in 1997 to be able to pass the Holocaust Memorial Day Act, which was the first time a Holocaust memorial act was passed anywhere in the world outside of Israel. So Ontario led the way in passing the first Holocaust memorial act—the Holocaust Memorial Day Act. Since that time, all 10 provinces have passed Holocaust memorial acts, and I believe that the count in the United States is over 30 states. So Ontario led the way in the Holocaust memorial area.

This year, Holocaust Memorial Day falls on the 27th of the month of Nisan. In the Julian calendar, that day translates to April 19. So it's a little early this year, as occurs from time to time, and maybe we'll celebrate it on April 19 or maybe we'll celebrate it on May 1. We'll see how things go.

1620

Many of us have spoken about the names that have been listed here, and it's interesting that—I would like to

make a few comments because many of them bring back memories or represent people that I've know.

Barbara Frum I met a number of times when she was on CBC. Of course, I enjoy reading her son's articles. It's very difficult to find—of course, the fourth estate isn't here right now, but they listen in their offices, so you have to always be careful what you say about the press because they're always listening. But I just say that it's difficult to find a conservative reporter, a conservative journalist. Whenever I see a byline by David Frum, of course I scan it carefully. It is difficult to find a conservative writer. David is.

Some of the other names that pop out: Honest Ed Mirvish. If there was a father of Canadian theatre, it was Ed Mirvish. He brings back wonderful memories of just a great guy who built live theatre in Toronto to become—I think we have the third most active live theatre of any city in the world, following London and New York. Toronto runs number three, and it's much to his credit that he made those things happen.

Johnny Wayne and Frank Shuster: I remember those two guys on TV—67 appearances on Ed Sullivan. But more than that, I remember them at the Toronto Maple Leaf games. Especially Johnny Wayne was a huge fan.

**Mr. John O'Toole:** That's when they used to win.

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** Well, I tell you, one of the memories that I have of the 1967 Stanley Cup championships: When we won, they were on the ice that year. Who knows? It's February, and we're still in contention.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** Get a goalie. The deadline's coming; you need one.

Anyway, great, great memories.

Peter Munk: The world's largest gold trader, and gold is trading at \$1,800 an ounce or whatever. As gold has moved up and down, who amongst us hasn't made a few bucks on a gold stock in this province? Great memories of him.

Sam Shopsowitz: Boy, the best corned beef sandwich that you can have anywhere in the province.

It goes on; I could go on.

Sam Sniderman: My father used to go down to Sam's record shop on Yonge Street to buy classical records.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Thank you.

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** I know I'm going over, Speaker—to buy classical records. It was one of the few places you could get a huge selection.

It's just part and parcel of our heritage in Ontario, and it's just so right that we have this month of May.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** It's truly an honour for me to get some remarks on the record this afternoon with regard to this bill, an Act to proclaim the month of May Jewish Heritage Month. I want to share with the Legislature this afternoon a bit of the Jewish heritage in my riding of Peterborough.

The first Jewish man known to have settled in Peterborough was a shoemaker, Mr. L. Kert, who arrived in 1881. Other early Jews came too, including Moses Levin and Phillip Schulman; both were merchants, and both, of course, moved on to Toronto.

Around the turn of the 20th century, three of the patriarchs of the Peterborough community came to settle in our community: Abraham Low, David Florence and Abraham Swartz. Several years later, they were joined by Mr. A. Cohen, Mr. Elkin and Mr. Fineberg.

These community pioneers had to work hard to make ends meet because they could not afford to hire a shochet or a teacher. However, they spent the money necessary to get kosher meat from Toronto. They also took turns hosting services in their homes and teaching the children.

David Florence and Abraham Low both settled in Peterborough in 1905, as did many other Jewish immigrants. Both men also started as material recyclers. David Florence had first arrived in Canada in 1901, going to Kingston and then to Toronto before settling in Peterborough. He worked for six years before he felt ready to send for his wife, Fanny, and their children, who were then in Lithuania.

In the first and second decades of the 20th century, Peterborough's Jewish population continued to grow. Messrs. Sukloff, Black, Cherney, Zacks, Green and Fine arrived in this period. All stayed to raise their families and become important parts of the Peterborough community.

By the mid-1950s, 78.7% of Peterborough's Jews had been born in Canada and another 20.5% were naturalized Canadians, meaning that almost all members of the community had Canadian citizenship.

A remarkable story in innovation and expansion is that of the Cherney brothers, Harry, Meyer and Lou. The growth of their furniture businesses is a good example of the remarkable results that a surprising number of determined and hard-working immigrants were able to achieve.

In the 1960s, Peterborough's Jewish community built the Beth Israel Synagogue, just east of the Peterborough Regional Health Centre. Peterborough's Jewish community built our community, and that's what we're very thankful for, Mr. Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. David Zimmer:** Speaker, it's my great pleasure to speak in favour of Jewish heritage day in Ontario. Everybody has made remarks about the tremendous contribution that the Jewish community has made. The month of May will recognize that contribution of the community, and it will recognize the contribution of the individuals that we've all heard about.

But there's a second purpose behind Jewish Heritage Month, and that is tying in with the Jewish community's great tradition of education and awareness. In Toronto, there are vast numbers of people, huge numbers of new immigrants, for instance, that have come into the city and

into the province. Many of these new groups, and indeed many of the groups that have been here for generations, although somewhat aware of the great Jewish cultural traditions and the great Jewish contribution to our community, still do not appreciate the depth and the quality of that contribution.

I rather expect that during the month of May, when we look at the agenda of all of the events that the Jewish community is going to host, the awareness of the Jewish contribution to life in Ontario is just going to be explosive throughout all of the other communities. I think that's a good thing, when you think of the society that we're trying to build here in Ontario, where all religious groups, all ethnic groups, all racial groups—we want everyone to live together harmoniously. One of the ways we do that is by understanding each other's culture, by appreciating each other's culture and building together.

I think that's the great benefit of a whole month of Jewish heritage events, awareness events and education events. It takes away some of the mystery; it answers some of the questions that other groups have about the Jewish community, and to the extent that we understand each other, that's good for Ontario and that's good for the Jewish community.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member for Eglinton–Lawrence, you have two minutes for a reply.

**Mr. Mike Colle:** I want to give my sincere thanks to all the members on both sides of the House who spoke so eloquently and passionately about this bill. I know that so many of you would like to speak even more, but time is limited. But I do really appreciate your heartfelt support on both sides.

I also would like to thank my rabbi, Rabbi Yossi Sapirman, who inspired me to do this, at Beth Torah Congregation. I'd also like to thank Dustin Cohen in my office, my executive assistant, for his incredible work, and my legislative intern, Greg Ruttan, who has done so much good work on this. They really went all out on this.

There were so many amazing comments made by all the members here. The member from Halton mentioned Sniderman. Well, I go back to Sniderman being on College Street, next to Kwinter's, at College and Grace, where we used to get the 45s. Lombardi was on the other side and Becker's was there, the deli. Like the member from Parkdale, I grew up at College and Grace, so we had a real mix. It was hard not to be schizophrenic: Were you Jewish? Were you Italian? Were you Catholic? But that's how we grew up in Toronto, and it was a wonderful time in the 1950s. We didn't play soccer; we played baseball, and our heroes were the same.

I just want to say that I dedicate this bill to my mother, who, as a young woman, was a seamstress and worked for one of the best tailors in Toronto, Mr. Wolfgang Pitke at Spadina and Dundas, who used to make suits for John Robarts.

They would tell my mother all the stories about being shanghaied Jews, coming all the way from Russia to

Vladivostok to Shanghai. So my mother learned how to cook cheesecake, how to do latkes, how to do kishkas.

Anyway, thank you so very much. Bye-bye.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The time provided for private members' public business has expired.

## CHILDHOOD OBESITY

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** We will deal first with ballot item number 10, standing in the name of Ms. Wong.

Ms. Wong has moved private member's notice of motion number 7. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I declare the motion carried.

*Motion agreed to.*

## PUBLIC SAFETY RELATED TO DOGS STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 2012

### LOI DE 2012 MODIFIANT DES LOIS EN CE QUI A TRAIT À LA SÉCURITÉ PUBLIQUE LIÉE AUX CHIENS

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Mr. Hillier has moved second reading of Bill 16. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I heard a no.

All those in favour of the motion, please say "aye."

All those opposed to the motion, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

We will take the vote after the next item.

## JEWISH HERITAGE MONTH ACT, 2012

### LOI DE 2012 SUR LE MOIS DU PATRIMOINE JUIF

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Mr. Colle has moved second reading of Bill 17. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I declare the motion carried.

*Second reading agreed to.*

## JEWISH HERITAGE MONTH ACT, 2012

### LOI DE 2012 SUR LE MOIS DU PATRIMOINE JUIF

Mr. Colle moved third reading of the following bill:

Bill 17, An Act to proclaim the month of May Jewish Heritage Month / Projet de loi 17, Loi proclamant le mois de mai Mois du patrimoine juif.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? The motion is carried.

Be it resolved that the bill do now pass and be entitled as in the motion.

*Third reading agreed to.*

PUBLIC SAFETY RELATED TO DOGS  
STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 2012

LOI DE 2012 MODIFIANT DES LOIS  
EN CE QUI A TRAIT À LA SÉCURITÉ  
PUBLIQUE LIÉE AUX CHIENS

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** We'll now call in the members for the vote. It'll be a five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1633 to 1638.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Mr. Hillier has moved second reading of Bill 16. All those in favour, rise and remain standing until recognized by the Clerk.

**Ayes**

Armstrong, Teresa J.	Harris, Michael	Natyshak, Taras
Arnott, Ted	Hillier, Randy	Nicholls, Rick
Bailey, Robert	Horwath, Andrea	O'Toole, John
Barrett, Toby	Hudak, Tim	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Bisson, Gilles	Jackson, Rod	Prue, Michael
Campbell, Sarah	Jones, Sylvia	Schein, Jonah
Chudleigh, Ted	Klees, Frank	Scott, Laurie
Clark, Steve	Leone, Rob	Shurman, Peter
Colle, Mike	MacLaren, Jack	Singh, Jagmeet
Crack, Grant	Mantha, Michael	Smith, Todd
Craitor, Kim	Marchese, Rosario	Tabuns, Peter
DiNovo, Cheri	McDonnell, Jim	Taylor, Monique
Dunlop, Garfield	McKenna, Jane	Thompson, Lisa M.
Elliott, Christine	McNaughton, Monte	Vanthof, John
Fedeli, Victor	Miller, Paul	Walker, Bill
Forster, Cindy	Milligan, Rob E.	Wilson, Jim
Hardeman, Ernie	Munro, Julia	Yurek, Jeff

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** All those opposed, please rise and remain—

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Order.

All those opposed, please rise and remain standing until recognized by the Clerk.

**Nays**

Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Jaczek, Helena	Naqvi, Yasir
Bradley, James J.	Jeffrey, Linda	Piruzza, Teresa
Coteau, Michael	Kwinter, Monte	Qaadri, Shafiq
Damerla, Dipika	Leal, Jeff	Sergio, Mario
Delaney, Bob	MacCharles, Tracy	Sousa, Charles
Dhillon, Vic	Mangat, Amrit	Wong, Soo
Dickson, Joe	McMeekin, Ted	Wynne, Kathleen O.
Duguid, Brad	Moridi, Reza	Zimmer, David
Flynn, Kevin Daniel	Murray, Glen R.	

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):** The ayes are 51; the nays are 26.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** I declare the motion carried.

*Second reading agreed to.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member from Lanark.

**Mr. Randy Hillier:** I'd like to have the bill referred to regulations and private bills.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Is the majority in favour of this bill being referred to the Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills? The majority being in agreement, the bill is referred to the Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills.

*Orders of the day?*

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of the House.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Mr. Bradley has moved adjournment of the House. Do I have agreement? Agreed.

This House stands adjourned until Monday at 10:30.

*The House adjourned at 1643.*

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO**  
**ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: Hon. / L'hon. David C. Onley, O.Ont.

Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Dave Levac

Clerk / Greffière: Deborah Deller

Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman, Tonia Grannum

Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Albanese, Laura (LIB)	York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston	
Armstrong, Teresa J. (NDP)	London–Fanshawe	
Arnott, Ted (PC)	Wellington–Halton Hills	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée
Bailey, Robert (PC)	Sarnia–Lambton	
Balkissoon, Bas (LIB)	Scarborough–Rouge River	Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée Deputy Speaker / Vice-président
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand–Norfolk	
Bartolucci, Hon. / L'hon. Rick (LIB)	Sudbury	Chair of Cabinet / Président du Conseil des ministres Minister of Northern Development and Mines / Ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie
Bentley, Hon. / L'hon. Christopher (LIB)	London West / London-Ouest	
Berardinetti, Lorenzo (LIB)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	
Best, Hon. / L'hon. Margaret R. (LIB)	Scarborough–Guildwood	Minister of Consumer Services / Ministre des Services aux consommateurs
Bisson, Gilles (NDP)	Timmins–James Bay / Timmins–Baie James	House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire de parti reconnu
Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (LIB)	St. Catharines	Minister of the Environment / Ministre de l'Environnement Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
Brotten, Hon. / L'hon. Laurel C. (LIB)	Etobicoke–Lakeshore	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation Minister Responsible for Women's Issues / Ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Campbell, Sarah (NDP)	Kenora–Rainy River	
Cansfield, Donna H. (LIB)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	
Chan, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)	Markham–Unionville	Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport / Ministre de Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport
Chiarelli, Hon. / L'hon. Bob (LIB)	Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Minister of Infrastructure / Ministre de l'Infrastructure Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Halton	
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds–Grenville	
Colle, Mike (LIB)	Eglinton–Lawrence	
Coteau, Michael (LIB)	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	
Crack, Grant (LIB)	Glengarry–Prescott–Russell	
Craitor, Kim (LIB)	Niagara Falls	
Damerla, Dipika (LIB)	Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville	
Delaney, Bob (LIB)	Mississauga–Streetsville	
Dhillon, Vic (LIB)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Dickson, Joe (LIB)	Ajax–Pickering	
DiNovo, Cheri (NDP)	Parkdale–High Park	
Duguid, Hon. / L'hon. Brad (LIB)	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Minister of Economic Development and Innovation / Ministre du Développement économique et de l'Innovation
Duncan, Hon. / L'hon. Dwight (LIB)	Windsor–Tecumseh	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / Président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement Deputy Premier / Vice-premier ministre Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances
Dunlop, Garfield (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	
Elliott, Christine (PC)	Whitby–Oshawa	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Fedeli, Victor (PC)	Nipissing	
Flynn, Kevin Daniel (LIB)	Oakville	
Forster, Cindy (NDP)	Welland	Deputy House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire adjointe de parti reconnu
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	
<b>Gerretsen, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles	Attorney General / Procureur général
<b>Gravelle, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Thunder Bay–Superior North / Thunder Bay–Superior-Nord	Minister of Natural Resources / Ministre des Richesses naturelles
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	
Harris, Michael (PC)	Kitchener–Conestoga	
Hillier, Randy (PC)	Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington	
Horwath, Andrea (NDP)	Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre	Leader, Recognized Party / Chef de parti reconnu Leader, New Democratic Party of Ontario / Chef du Nouveau parti démocratique de l'Ontario
<b>Hoskins, Hon. / L'hon. Eric (LIB)</b>	St. Paul's	Minister of Children and Youth Services / Ministre des Services à l'enfance et à la jeunesse
Hudak, Tim (PC)	Niagara West–Glanbrook / Niagara-Ouest–Glanbrook	Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle Leader, Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur de l'Ontario
Jackson, Rod (PC)	Barrie	
Jaczek, Helena (LIB)	Oak Ridges–Markham	
<b>Jeffrey, Hon. / L'hon. Linda (LIB)</b>	Brampton–Springdale	Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail Minister Responsible for Seniors / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires des personnes âgées
Jones, Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin–Caledon	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Klees, Frank (PC)	Newmarket–Aurora	
Kwinter, Monte (LIB)	York Centre / York-Centre	
Leal, Jeff (LIB)	Peterborough	
Leone, Rob (PC)	Cambridge	
<b>Levac, Hon. / L'hon. Dave (LIB)</b>	Brant	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
MacCharles, Tracy (LIB)	Pickering–Scarborough East / Pickering–Scarborough-Est	
MacLaren, Jack (PC)	Carleton–Mississippi Mills	
MacLeod, Lisa (PC)	Nepean–Carleton	
Mangat, Amrit (LIB)	Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud	
Mantha, Michael (NDP)	Algoma–Manitoulin	
Marchese, Rosario (NDP)	Trinity–Spadina	
<b>Matthews, Hon. / L'hon. Deborah (LIB)</b>	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / Ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Mauro, Bill (LIB)	Thunder Bay–Atikokan	
McDonell, Jim (PC)	Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry	
<b>McGuinty, Hon. / L'hon. Dalton (LIB)</b>	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales Premier / Premier ministre Leader, Government / Chef du gouvernement Leader, Liberal Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti libéral de l'Ontario
McKenna, Jane (PC)	Burlington	
<b>McMeekin, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (LIB)</b>	Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough–Westdale	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
McNaughton, Monte (PC)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	
McNeely, Phil (LIB)	Ottawa–Orléans	
<b>Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (LIB)</b>	Ottawa–Vanier	Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / Ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones
Miller, Norm (PC)	Parry Sound–Muskoka	
<b>Miller, Paul (NDP)</b>	Hamilton East–Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est–Stoney Creek	Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Milligan, Rob E. (PC)	Northumberland—Quinte West	Minister of Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement
<b>Millroy, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	
Moridi, Reza (LIB)	Richmond Hill	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Munro, Julia (PC)</b>	York—Simcoe	
<b>Murray, Hon. / L'hon. Glen R. (LIB)</b>	Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Naqvi, Yasir (LIB)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	
Natyshak, Taras (NDP)	Essex	
Nicholls, Rick (PC)	Chatham—Kent—Essex	
O'Toole, John (PC)	Durham	
Oraziotti, David (LIB)	Sault Ste. Marie	
Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Oshawa	
Pettapiece, Randy (PC)	Perth—Wellington	
Piruzza, Teresa (LIB)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	
Prue, Michael (NDP)	Beaches—East York	
Qaadri, Shafiq (LIB)	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	
Sandals, Liz (LIB)	Guelph	
Schein, Jonah (NDP)	Davenport	
Scott, Laurie (PC)	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	
Sergio, Mario (LIB)	York West / York-Ouest	
Shurman, Peter (PC)	Thornhill	
Singh, Jagmeet (NDP)	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	
Smith, Todd (PC)	Prince Edward—Hastings	
Sorbara, Greg (LIB)	Vaughan	
<b>Sousa, Hon. / L'hon. Charles (LIB)</b>	Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration / Ministre des Affaires civiques et de l'Immigration
Tabuns, Peter (NDP)	Toronto—Danforth	
<b>Takhar, Hon. / L'hon. Harinder S. (LIB)</b>	Mississauga—Erindale	Minister of Government Services / Ministre des Services gouvernementaux
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain	
Thompson, Lisa M. (PC)	Huron—Bruce	
Vanthof, John (NDP)	Timiskaming—Cochrane	
Walker, Bill (PC)	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	
Wilson, Jim (PC)	Simcoe—Grey	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle
Witmer, Elizabeth (PC)	Kitchener—Waterloo	
Wong, Soo (LIB)	Scarborough—Agincourt	
<b>Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (LIB)</b>	Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Yakubski, John (PC)	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	
Yurek, Jeff (PC)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	
Zimmer, David (LIB)	Willowdale	

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Standing Committee on Estimates / Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Grant Crack, Kim Craitor  
Vic Dhillon, Michael Harris  
Rob Leone, Taras Natyshak  
Rick Nicholls, Michael Prue  
Mario Sergio  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs /  
Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Bob Delaney, Victor Fedeli  
Cindy Forster, Monte McNaughton  
Yasir Naqvi, Teresa Piruzza  
Michael Prue, Peter Shurman  
Soo Wong  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on General Government / Comité  
permanent des affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Sarah Campbell, Michael Coteau  
Joe Dickson, Rosario Marchese  
David Oraziotti, Laurie Scott  
Todd Smith, Jeff Yurek  
David Zimmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przewdziecki

**Standing Committee on Government Agencies / Comité  
permanent des organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Donna H. Cansfield, Helena Jaczek  
Bill Mauro, Jim McDonell  
Phil McNeely, Randy Pettapiece  
Peter Tabuns, Monique Taylor  
Lisa M. Thompson  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Justice Policy / Comité permanent de  
la justice**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Laura Albanese, Teresa J. Armstrong  
Lorenzo Berardinetti, Mike Colle  
Frank Klees, Jack MacLaren  
Paul Miller, Rob E. Milligan  
Shafiq Qadri  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly / Comité  
permanent de l'Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Laura Albanese, Bas Balkissoon  
Gilles Bisson, Donna H. Cansfield  
Steve Clark, Garfield Dunlop  
Jeff Leal, Lisa MacLeod  
Jonah Schein  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts / Comité permanent  
des comptes publics**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Toby Barrett, France Gélinas  
Phil McNeely, Norm Miller  
Reza Moridi, Jerry J. Ouellette  
Liz Sandals, Jagmeet Singh  
David Zimmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills / Comité  
permanent des règlements et des projets de loi d'intérêt privé**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Michael Coteau, Grant Crack  
Vic Dhillon, Randy Hillier  
Rod Jackson, Mario Sergio  
Peter Tabuns, John Vanthof  
Bill Walker  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Tamara Pomanski

**Standing Committee on Social Policy / Comité permanent de  
la politique sociale**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Ted Chudleigh, Dipika Damerla  
Cheri DiNovo, Kevin Daniel Flynn  
Ernie Hardeman, Tracy MacCharles  
Amrit Mangat, Michael Mantha  
Jane McKenna  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch



## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Mr. John O'Toole.....	623
Mr. Jack MacLaren .....	623
Mr. Jagmeet Singh .....	623
Mr. Jagmeet Singh .....	623
Ms. Soo Wong.....	623
Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....	623

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS / DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

### Horse racing industry

Mr. Ted Chudleigh.....	623
------------------------	-----

### Health promotion

Mr. Paul Miller.....	623
----------------------	-----

### Riding of Niagara Falls

Mr. Kim Craitor .....	624
-----------------------	-----

### Dog ownership

Mrs. Julia Munro.....	624
-----------------------	-----

### Refugees

Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....	624
-----------------------	-----

### Ed Arnold

Mr. Jeff Leal.....	624
--------------------	-----

### Live bait industry

Ms. Laurie Scott.....	625
-----------------------	-----

### Suicide prevention

Mr. Yasir Naqvi .....	625
-----------------------	-----

### Town of Goderich

Ms. Lisa M. Thompson .....	625
----------------------------	-----

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS / DÉPÔT DES PROJETS DE LOI

### Radon Awareness and Prevention Act, 2012, Bill 36,

Mr. Moridi / Loi de 2012 sur la sensibilisation au radon et la protection contre l'infiltration de ce gaz, projet de loi 36, M. Moridi	
First reading agreed to.....	626
Mr. Reza Moridi.....	626

### Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to

Animals Amendment Act, 2012, Bill 37,	
Mr. MacLaren / Loi de 2012 modifiant la Loi sur la Société de protection des animaux de l'Ontario, projet de loi 37, M. MacLaren	
First reading agreed to.....	626
Mr. Jack MacLaren .....	626

## MOTIONS

### Order of business

Hon. James J. Bradley .....	626
Motion agreed to .....	627

## STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES / DÉCLARATIONS MINISTÉRIELLES ET RÉPONSES

### Queen Elizabeth II Diamond Jubilee Medal

Hon. Charles Sousa .....	627
Mrs. Jane McKenna.....	627
Mr. Michael Prue .....	628
The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac) .....	629

## PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS

### Rural schools

Mr. Jim Wilson.....	629
---------------------	-----

### Dog ownership

Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....	629
-----------------------	-----

### Long-term care

Mr. Ernie Hardeman.....	629
-------------------------	-----

### Environmental protection

Mr. John O'Toole.....	629
-----------------------	-----

### Dog ownership

Mr. Randy Hillier .....	630
-------------------------	-----

### Dog ownership

Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....	630
-----------------------	-----

### Renewable energy

Mr. Jim Wilson.....	630
---------------------	-----

### Child care

Mr. Rob Leone .....	630
---------------------	-----

### Renewable energy

Mr. John O'Toole.....	631
-----------------------	-----

### Tuition

Mr. Rob Leone .....	631
---------------------	-----

### Dog ownership

Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....	631
-----------------------	-----

### Renewable energy

Mr. Ernie Hardeman.....	632
-------------------------	-----

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS / AFFAIRES D'INTÉRÊT PUBLIC ÉMANANT DES DÉPUTÉS

### Childhood obesity

Ms. Soo Wong.....	632
Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer .....	634

Mme France Gélinas .....	634	Mrs. Christine Elliott.....	650
Ms. Helena Jaczek.....	635	Mr. Rosario Marchese .....	651
Mrs. Jane McKenna .....	636	Mr. Monte Kwinter .....	651
Ms. Cindy Forster .....	636	Mr. Ted Chudleigh.....	651
Mrs. Liz Sandals .....	637	Mr. Jeff Leal.....	652
Mr. Rod Jackson .....	637	Mr. David Zimmer .....	652
Mr. Taras Natyshak.....	638	Mr. Mike Colle.....	653
Ms. Tracy MacCharles .....	638	<b>Childhood obesity</b>	
Mr. Ted Chudleigh.....	638	Motion agreed to .....	653
Ms. Soo Wong.....	639	<b>Public Safety Related to Dogs Statute Law</b>	
<b>Public Safety Related to Dogs Statute Law</b>		Amendment Act, 2012, Bill 16, Mr. Hillier, Mr.	
Amendment Act, 2012, Bill 16, Mr. Hillier, Mr.		Craitor, Ms. DiNovo / Loi de 2012 modifiant des	
lois en ce qui a trait à la sécurité publique liée aux		chiens, projet de loi 16, M. Hillier, M. Craitor,	
chiens, projet de loi 16, M. Hillier, M. Craitor,		Mme DiNovo	
Mme DiNovo		The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon).....	653
Mr. Randy Hillier.....	639	<b>Jewish Heritage Month Act, 2012, Bill 17, Mr. Colle,</b>	
Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....	640	Mr. Shurman, Ms. DiNovo / Loi de 2012 sur le	
Mr. Kim Craitor .....	642	Mois du patrimoine juif, projet de loi 17, M. Colle,	
Mrs. Julia Munro.....	643	M. Shurman, Mme DiNovo	
Mr. David Zimmer .....	644	Second reading agreed to .....	653
Mr. Jack MacLaren .....	644	<b>Jewish Heritage Month Act, 2012, Bill 17, Mr. Colle,</b>	
Mr. Steve Clark .....	645	Mr. Shurman, Ms. DiNovo / Loi de 2012 sur le	
Mr. Randy Hillier.....	645	Mois du patrimoine juif, projet de loi 17, M. Colle,	
<b>Jewish Heritage Month Act, 2012, Bill 17, Mr. Colle,</b>		M. Shurman, Mme DiNovo	
Mr. Shurman, Ms. DiNovo / Loi de 2012 sur le		Third reading agreed to .....	653
Mois du patrimoine juif, projet de loi 17, M. Colle,		<b>Public Safety Related to Dogs Statute Law</b>	
M. Shurman, Mme DiNovo		Amendment Act, 2012, Bill 16, Mr. Hillier, Mr.	
Mr. Mike Colle.....	646	Craitor, Ms. DiNovo / Loi de 2012 modifiant des	
Mr. Peter Shurman .....	647	lois en ce qui a trait à la sécurité publique liée aux	
Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....	648	chiens, projet de loi 16, M. Hillier, M. Craitor,	
Mr. Paul Miller.....	649	Mme DiNovo	
Hon. Eric Hoskins .....	650	Second reading agreed to .....	654

## CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Thursday 23 February 2012 / Jeudi 23 février 2012

### **Member for Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington**

Hon. James J. Bradley ..... 601

### **Committee membership**

Hon. James J. Bradley ..... 601

Mr. Jim Wilson ..... 603

Mr. Gilles Bisson ..... 603

Motion agreed to ..... 605

### **ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR**

#### **Family Caregiver Leave Act (Employment Standards Amendment), 2012, Bill 30, Mrs. Jeffrey / Loi de 2012 sur le congé familial pour les aidants naturels (modification des normes d'emploi), projet de loi 30, Mme Jeffrey**

Hon. Linda Jeffrey ..... 605

Ms. Cindy Forster ..... 608

Hon. Linda Jeffrey ..... 608

Mr. Jack MacLaren ..... 608

Mr. Rick Nicholls ..... 611

Second reading debate deemed adjourned ..... 612

### **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS**

Mrs. Christine Elliott ..... 612

Hon. James J. Bradley ..... 612

Ms. Soo Wong ..... 612

Mr. Jack MacLaren ..... 612

Hon. Michael Gravelle ..... 612

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac) ..... 612

### **ORAL QUESTIONS / QUESTIONS ORALES**

#### **Public services**

Mr. Tim Hudak ..... 612

Hon. Dalton McGuinty ..... 613

#### **Public services**

Mr. Tim Hudak ..... 613

Hon. Dalton McGuinty ..... 613

#### **Taxation**

Ms. Andrea Horwath ..... 614

Hon. Dalton McGuinty ..... 614

#### **Air ambulance service**

Ms. Andrea Horwath ..... 615

Hon. Dalton McGuinty ..... 615

Hon. Deborah Matthews ..... 615

#### **Air ambulance service**

Mr. Frank Klees ..... 616

Hon. Deborah Matthews ..... 616

#### **Air ambulance service**

Mme France Gélinas ..... 616

Hon. Deborah Matthews ..... 616

#### **Economic development**

Mr. Grant Crack ..... 617

Hon. Brad Duguid ..... 617

#### **Air ambulance service**

Mr. Frank Klees ..... 618

Hon. Deborah Matthews ..... 618

#### **Air ambulance service**

Mr. Taras Natyshak ..... 618

Hon. Deborah Matthews ..... 618

#### **Community safety**

Mr. David Zimmer ..... 619

Hon. Madeleine Meilleur ..... 619

#### **Air ambulance service**

Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer ..... 619

Hon. Deborah Matthews ..... 619

#### **Education funding**

Mr. Peter Tabuns ..... 620

Hon. Laurel C. Broten ..... 620

#### **Aboriginal land claims**

Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn ..... 620

Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne ..... 620

#### **Air ambulance service**

Mr. Victor Fedeli ..... 621

Hon. Deborah Matthews ..... 621

#### **Health care**

Ms. Sarah Campbell ..... 621

Hon. Deborah Matthews ..... 621

### **DEFERRED VOTES / VOTES DIFFÉRÉS**

**Healthy Homes Renovation Tax Credit Act, 2012, Bill 2, Mr. Duncan / Loi de 2012 sur le crédit d'impôt pour l'aménagement du logement axé sur le bien-être, projet de loi 2, M. Duncan**  
Second reading agreed to ..... 623

*Continued on inside back cover*

20N  
X1  
D23

Gouvernement  
Publique



No. 16

N° 16

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 40<sup>th</sup> Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 40<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Monday 27 February 2012

Lundi 27 février 2012

Speaker  
Honourable Dave Levac

Clerk  
Deborah Deller

Président  
L'honorable Dave Levac

Greffière  
Deborah Deller



### **Hansard on the Internet**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

### **Le Journal des débats sur Internet**

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

### **Renseignements sur l'index**

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.



## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 27 February 2012

## ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lundi 27 février 2012

*The House met at 1030.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Please join me in prayer.

*Prayers.*

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Mr. Monte McNaughton:** I'd like to take this opportunity to welcome some community leaders from the riding of Lambton–Kent–Middlesex. We have the mayor of Brooke-Alvinston, Don McGugan, and his wife, Anne; and we have Councillor Frank Nemcek, all representing the riding of Lambton–Kent–Middlesex and Brooke-Alvinston.

**Mr. Michael Mantha:** I would like to introduce and welcome Jerry and Jill Shields, the proud parents of Mackenzie, who are from the riding of Algoma–Manitoulin. Mackenzie is one of our proud and very good pages here in the House.

**Hon. Margaret R. Best:** I take this opportunity to welcome Dan Newman to the Ontario Legislature today. In addition to being a former member of the House, he is also the proud father of page James Newman, from the great riding of Scarborough–Guildwood.

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** I'd like to welcome back to the Legislature Dan Newman, a former MPP and minister from the ridings of Scarborough Southwest and Scarborough Centre and, more importantly, the proud father of page James Newman.

**Mr. Jonah Schein:** I'd like to welcome, later this morning, students from Dewson public school in the riding of Davenport. Dewson students have been very engaged in recent elections. They're very interested in our community, and I'm happy to welcome them later this morning.

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** Today we're joined in the gallery by the Independent School Bus Operators Association. Attending with us today are Steve Hull, the president of the association; Vaughn Richmond; Roland Montgomery; Frank Healey; Lesa McDougall; and their executive director, Karen Cameron. Also with them are two operators: Eric Hogaschurtz and Rod Cook. Also, there is a member of the Independent School Bus Operators Association: Wanda Rothwell.

Mr. Speaker, ISBOA will be outside with 70 school buses circling Queen's Park to protest this McGuinty Liberal government.

**Miss Monique Taylor:** Today I have the privilege of introducing one of my dear friends. Lyndon George is in

the gallery with us today. Lyndon was a great help on my campaign, and now he's working in our leader's office in Hamilton, in Andrea's office. Welcome, Lyndon.

**Mr. Rod Jackson:** I'm delighted to introduce the family of Barrie page Ruby Yee. Ruby is an outstanding student at Codrington Public School and a great role model in our community. Please help me welcome Sarah Uffelunanu, her mother; Irvan Yee, her father; Elliott Yee, also a former page here; Maris Uffelunanu, her aunt; and Fred Uff, her grandpa. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** It's my privilege to introduce Bev Craddock, who is my constituent, and Dr. Karen Somerville. They are here today to draw attention to the issues surrounding Tarion.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further introductions?

Just before we begin, I want to offer an apology. I did not have my book with me. I do know the Our Father off by heart, but I did not have the names of the other pray-ers, so I apologize to the House for my start of this morning.

It is now time for oral questions.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### TAXATION

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Speaker, if you will, let me first say on behalf of the Ontario PC caucus that we extend our condolences, our thoughts and prayers to the families impacted by the tragedy in Burlington with Via Rail. We also commend our front-line emergency service workers and all of the volunteers in the Burlington area who came out to try to assist those going through that tragedy. Thank you, Speaker.

This is a question to the Premier. Premier, we have a debt crisis in the province of Ontario, and we have a growing jobs crisis at the same time. Mr. Drummond's report gets us a long way to addressing the debt crisis, but what he leaves out is the jobs crisis in our province. We in the Ontario PC caucus believe that in order to create jobs in Ontario, to make us a leader again, we need to continue to lower taxes on employers, on job creators in the province of Ontario.

So a simple question to the Premier: Premier, will you continue with the current schedule to hit a 10% business tax rate by July 1, 2013?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, if I may, I too would like to second the sentiment expressed a moment

ago by my honourable colleague with respect to the disaster that struck an Ontario community just yesterday. We extend our thoughts and prayers, particularly to the families and friends who lost a loved one. We, too, commend all of our emergency response people, our first responders, for performing heroically under very difficult conditions, and of course we look forward to participating with the federal government in any way to ensure that we might draw whatever lessons we can to ensure that this kind of tragedy is not repeated.

1040

As to the question raised by my honourable colleague with respect to corporate taxes, what I will say at this point in time is that we're proud of the progress that we have made as a government in Ontario. We have consistently reduced the tax burden on our businesses. We have eliminated the capital tax. We have, several times now, reduced corporate taxes. We've adopted the HST, against the express wishes of my colleagues opposite. We have done a great deal to ensure that we have a—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Thank you, Speaker. I'm not sure the Premier answered my question directly. He seems to be hinting that he is now backing away from something he campaigned on just months ago.

Here's the problem, Premier; here's our concern: In the less than two weeks since Mr. Drummond's report came out, you've backed way from a number of his recommendations—\$1.5 billion for full-day kindergarten, the clean energy benefit, the non-teaching school staff, the cap on class sizes, the tuition grant. You've added on the home renovation tax credit, I understand, today. At ROMA you announced that you are disregarding Mr. Drummond's recommendation on municipal financing.

Premier, you're now at well over \$4 billion that you've taken off the table. At this pace, I don't know if any pages will be left at all in the Drummond report.

The concern I have is that you have two choices: to cut spending elsewhere or to increase taxes. Premier, are you actually going to increase taxes in the province of Ontario and break your own law passed last year?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** No, Speaker, we won't do that. But what I can say is we're keeping our eye on the requests that we're receiving on a regular basis now from my honourable colleague or his colleagues with respect to new expenditures they would like us to make. Those include, for example, a new racetrack they're asking us to support funding for in Belleville, a new high school in Nepean-Carleton, a new university in Barrie and a new health care lab in Halton. They'd like additional money for new or expanded hospitals in Oxford, Burlington, Huron-Bruce, Simcoe-Grey and Perth-Wellington. They're asking us to invest in new highways or road funding in Parry Sound-Muskoka, Burlington, Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke, Stormont-Dundas-South Glengarry, Simcoe-Grey, Haliburton-Kawartha Lakes-Brock and Sarnia. The list, I must say, keeps growing for new expenditure requests from that side.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Again, Premier, you're taking us towards a \$30-billion annual deficit under the Drummond report. That means we would effectively be tripling the provincial debt.

The challenge we have, Premier, is that you've not announced a single initiative to try to get back to balancing the books. In fact, you've gone in the opposite direction and piled on some \$4.5 billion more. In effect, you're digging a deeper hole.

But the problem, Premier, is: I don't think the answer is your answer, which is to increase tax in the province of Ontario. I think in the midst of a jobs crisis that would be the wrong way to go.

So I'll ask you again a very simple and direct question: Will you maintain the goal of hitting a 10% tax rate on job creators by July 1, 2013, or will you effectively be having a higher tax rate at that point in time which will simply exacerbate the jobs crisis we have here in the province of Ontario?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, again, I'm very proud of the progress that we've made in Ontario with respect to ensuring that we have a competitive tax environment. As I said, we've adopted the HST and eliminated capital taxes, and we have, on several occasions now, reduced corporate taxes.

We are now, after California, the second most favoured destination in North America for foreign direct investment. We created 121,000 new jobs last year. And my concern is—understanding that in a knowledge-based global economy, we all get that it's so important to invest in the skills and education of our people—why it is that my honourable colleague would deprive 250,000 four- and five-year-olds of the tremendous benefits of a great start in education, something that continues in terms of benefits through elementary, high school and post-secondary, and why he stands against full-day kindergarten for our youngest learners.

## TAXATION

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Premier, I just wish you'd be direct on this issue. In the answer to Ms. Horwath on Thursday, there was similar dissembling. Your answers to me have a degree of dissembling as well. Premier, just be direct; if you are not going to follow through, just tell us.

We've brought forward a motion in the House to be debated on Wednesday that says very clearly that we should continue to ensure that we hit that 10% tax rate in July 1, 2013. We believe that's essential to creating jobs in the province of Ontario.

Premier, there's going to be a vote Wednesday. You can say it now: If you're backing down on this promise, why don't you just tell us?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** As my brain registered, the member did say something that was unparliamentary, and I'd ask him to withdraw it.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Withdraw.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Premier?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, I look forward to the debate, which I understand will take place during private members' hour, and I know that individual members will do as they feel is appropriate and responsible given our circumstances.

But what I will say is that we have worked really hard to strike the right balance between ensuring we have a competitive tax and regulatory environment and ensuring we have the continuing capacity to fund good schools and good health care. That's not a balance that is easy to strike, Speaker, but I would argue that we've gone a long way towards improving both our schools and our health care and the competitiveness of our tax environment.

In fact, *Forbes* magazine, only a few months ago, specifically said that they've now ranked Canada as the number 1 destination for foreign direct investment on the basis of tax measures adopted by the province of Ontario. So again, I think we're striking that right balance.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Premier, to make sure we are clear: It's not a private member's bill; it is a motion in the House, standing in the name of the opposition, to be debated Wednesday. It reads as follows: I move "that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario reaffirms its support for the planned reduction of the business tax rate on Ontario's job creators to 10% by next year, to help get the nearly 600,000 unemployed" women and men in Ontario "working again."

Premier, we have a jobs crisis in the province. The last time you increased business taxes—I remind you, that was a catastrophic error in one of your earlier budgets—we lost 200,000 manufacturing jobs. The decline continues: 60,000 private sector jobs gone since election day alone.

Premier, you used to say you were in favour of this. Now you seem to be backpedalling away, just like you're backpedalling away from the Drummond report. Please tell us: If we're going to attract jobs to the province of Ontario, should we not consider lowering business taxes to reward employers in the province?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, of course my honourable colleague in the official opposition says that the only thing we need to do would be to cut business taxes. My honourable colleague the leader of the third party says that the only thing that we need to do would be to increase business taxes. We think the truth lies, in fact, somewhere in the middle.

I recommend to my honourable colleague that he take into account the following, I think, very interesting fact: Last year, as we were coming out of the recession, Ontarians with a high school education experienced a 9,000 jobs net loss. On the other hand, our college and university grads experienced a 119,000 jobs net gain. That tells me that, apart from the tax debate, it's really important that we keep our eye on the skills and education levels debate. I think it's very important we find ways to support that, including supporting full-day kindergarten, where learning first begins.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Well, with respect, Premier, you know we've brought forward ideas to create jobs in the province, including modernizing our apprenticeship system to create 200,000 jobs in the skilled trades. We actually would put cabinet to the test, and if they failed to reduce the red tape burden by a minimum of a 30% reduction in regulations, I would dock their pay, and I'd dock my pay as Premier as well. We'd get the province moving. We would also end your massive subsidies to wind and solar projects that are being forced on communities across the province of Ontario and driving energy rates. So there's a comprehensive approach when it comes to creating jobs.

Premier, in November, you said, "These corporate tax cuts are in fact having an impact on the front lines. They will mean more jobs." Dalton McGuinty said that in the House on November 30.

You've changed your mind, Premier. I greet this, I guess, with sadness but not surprise. Please tell us the November Dalton McGuinty will carry through on supporting job creation and lowering business—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Premier?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** I say to my honourable colleague once again, I appreciate his interest in the upcoming budget, but he'll have to wait for it to be presented in this House in order for us to get a good sense of what is going to be in there.

But ultimately, it's a matter of the values that inform our decision-making here. My honourable colleague opposite says that he's against full-day kindergarten. He's against giving our 250,000 youngest learners the best possible start they could have in their schooling.

1050

On the other hand, he's in favour of a \$345-million subsidy to racetracks in Ontario. That, I think, stands as a good point of contrast between where they stand and where we stand.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order. The member from Chatham.

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** We think we're on good priorities, especially when it comes to health care and education, those two vital services which all our families and all our communities have got to be able to continue to count on.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Before I begin, I also want, on behalf of New Democrats, to express our deep sympathies to the families of the people who were killed in yesterday's tragedy, as well as to all those people who were injured and experienced such trauma in Burlington, thanking as well those people who responded, both EMS first responders as well as volunteers who came out, and the people in the medical community who helped with

some of the victims. It was a terrible tragedy and one that, hopefully, we will not see again, because we will figure out what went wrong and make sure that that doesn't happen again in Ontario.

Speaker, my question is to the Premier. In a recent letter to the editor, former Health Minister George Smitherman writes of Ornge: "To suggest that this model didn't go to cabinet is just plain folly ... no piece of legislation goes directly to the floor of the Legislature without first going through cabinet."

Can the Premier confirm that Mr. Smitherman is correct in what he is saying?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** I appreciate the question by my honourable colleague. Of course, any piece of legislation follows the appropriate and due process to ensure that we're in fact doing what needs to be done.

What I can say is that the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care has moved diligently and decisively to inspire greater confidence in our air ambulance system in Ontario, which we know as Ornge. In fact, I understand that just yesterday, at the time of this tragedy, Ornge was involved in airlifting the injured from that site. I commend those people again who work so hard and diligently on the front line.

My concern again is that the leadership let them down. That's why we sent in a team of forensic accountants. That's why we've turned that information over to the Ontario Provincial Police. That's why we have replaced the executive and we have replaced the board.

We very much look forward to the recommendations of the Auditor General as well, with respect to his findings there.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Can the Premier confirm that he approved the structure for Ornge that exempted this new organization from freedom-of-information requests?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Health.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Before I respond to the question, I also want to acknowledge what we all witnessed in Ontario and, indeed, well beyond Ontario's borders yesterday when disaster struck. Our first responders—our police, our land ambulance, our air ambulance, our hospitals—all came together to work with one goal in mind and that was to care for the people who were injured in the train derailment in Burlington. I want to thank those first responders, and I want to tell them that we are all enormously proud of the work they do.

Speaker, what I can tell you is that—perhaps I will quote, actually, from Hansard. This is in March 2007, debating Bill 171.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Answer?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I look forward to the supplementary, and I will carry on with the quote from Hansard then.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My final question in this round is, can the Premier confirm that he approved a

structure for Ornge that exempted this new organization from the requirements of salary disclosure?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** What I can share is what I've already shared several times, but I will do it again. We believe that the agreement, as it was originally struck, was not strong enough.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I do try "Order," and if it doesn't happen, you make me stand, and if you make me stand, you steal time from others. Please, carefully listen to the answer.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** The agreement did not give us oversight of the for-profit entities that were created. We are now winding down those for-profit entities, and we are developing a much stronger performance agreement that will give us the transparency and the oversight that the people of this province deserve.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, my next question is also for the Premier. When the Premier was establishing Ornge, why did he make it a quasi-private entity that would be exempt and would be able to hide information from this Legislature and from the people of Ontario?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Health.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I'm happy to have the question, because I realize I did not complete the quote. On March 26, 2007, this Legislature debated Bill 171, the Health System Improvements Act, and here is a quote: "I know that our party certainly can take some pride in what we have done in helping to create a world-renowned air and land ambulance service." That was the member—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Northumberland is warned.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:**—from Kitchener.

The same member referenced Dr. Chris Mazza, and said, "I have full confidence that this recommendation, which I support, this newly rebranded ambulance service, will continue to deliver the high-calibre care to our sickest patients in the province of Ontario."

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Under the veil of secrecy, this agency has systematically squandered health care dollars on everything from well-connected Liberal lawyers to personal gyms and luxury hotels. Now we learn that \$25 million is completely unaccounted for. The Premier said that he's proud of the job that his minister's doing. Is he proud of the work that he's done?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** We have put a new leadership team in place at Ornge. The former leadership is out; the new leadership is in. Their first responsibility was to address issues related to patient safety. They have taken steps in that regard. They are now very closely looking at a range of financial issues. The entire board is focused on that. These financial matters, including the allocation of the \$275 million, is part of the ongoing OPP investigation. However, rest assured, I understand that the new

leadership team is able to account for that full \$275 million. I cannot speak to further details because of the ongoing police investigation.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** The facts remain: The Premier worked with the former Minister of Health to establish Ornge. He exempted it from freedom-of-information laws, from salary disclosure, from legislative scrutiny. The president of the Liberal Party of Canada and Ornge executives briefed the Premier's staff about what they had planned for Ornge. Now millions and millions of health care dollars—scarce health care dollars—have been squandered on perks and sky-high salaries, and \$25 million remains unaccounted for.

The Premier says that the Minister of Health shouldn't have to take responsibility. My question to the Premier is: Where exactly does this buck stop?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I take full responsibility for fixing the problems we have uncovered at Ornge. Let me tell you that not a day goes by where we don't learn more, and it underlines that we made the right decision when we put in place new leadership at Ornge.

As we move forward, we are developing a new performance agreement. The old performance agreement did not have the necessary provisions to prevent the change to the corporate structure that did occur at Ornge. At the time the performance agreement was created, this new corporate structure was not envisioned.

Speaker, we are moving forward. We look to the support of all members of this House to strengthen Ornge so that they can continue to do the work that we are so grateful that they do.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** To the Minister of Health: In a letter dated January 19, 2011—that's more than a year ago—the former chair of the board of directors of Ornge informed the Minister of Health of the details of the ministry's performance agreement with Ornge and the new business ventures that were being undertaken. That letter confirms that an in-person meeting with ministry officials was scheduled for January 24, 2011, for the purpose of elaborating on that briefing document. Speaker, will the minister agree to provide us with a comprehensive list of the attendees of that January 24 meeting?

1100

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, this weekend I took several hours to actually go to Ornge bases. I went to the Ornge base in Sudbury, Speaker; I went to the Ornge base in London, and I had wonderful conversations with the front-line staff at those bases because I wanted to hear straight from them what was going on. We hear about it in this Legislature, Speaker; I wanted to hear from the pilots, from the medics, the mechanics and engineers who look after the aircraft. I wanted to understand from their perspective how they felt things were going at Ornge.

I can tell you: Overwhelmingly, they are supportive of the decisions we have made to replace the leadership with people who are listening to their concerns and responding to their concerns.

I have to tell you, I urge any other member of the House to visit—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Speaker, it was a very simple question. What is the minister hiding by not letting us know who attended that meeting?

Now Speaker, I just sent a document to the minister, which is a copy of the schematic that accompanied the briefing document that was delivered to the minister more than a year ago. Copies are available for members of the Legislature.

I would ask the minister to tell us if she wasn't even slightly concerned after seeing the complex web of corporate entities, holding companies, real estate companies, trusts, guarantees, pledge agreements, US corporate entities, head leases, subleases and charities that are part and parcel of that schematic that she's looking at now. Was that not enough to ring the bells that something devious was going on in this organization?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, it was precisely—*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Member from Renfrew, come to order. Your warning.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** It was precisely because there were concerns raised about the structure of Ornge, about our inability to get information from Ornge, Speaker—the ministry officials had trouble getting information. The Auditor General of the province of Ontario was unable to get information. Every request for information was met with a minimalist response. There was not the spirit of co-operation and collaboration that we expect from our providers, from our partners in delivering health care. And it is precisely why, after giving the process time to work—it wasn't working—that is exactly why I called in the senior leadership of Ornge and told them to provide us with the information that the—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** To the Minister of Health: It has been nearly a year and a half since New Democrats began asking questions about Ornge. We now know that the waste of scarce health care dollars at Ornge was rampant and reckless. Health care dollars were being used for seven-figure salaries, for private chefs, gym memberships and for fees that found their way to the Liberal Party president. We're now hearing that Ornge has lost nearly \$25 million.

Madam Minister, where's the money? Where is the money?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I would simply caution members of this Legislature to respect the OPP

investigation that is ongoing. I said in an earlier question that that is the work of this ongoing investigation, and I think we all want to see justice done.

What I can tell you, Speaker, is: The people of this province want me to fix the problem, and that is exactly what we are doing. We're bringing in a new performance agreement. We not only want to fix the problem that we found; we also want to make sure it never happens again.

I have said many times: The original performance agreement did not provide us with the ability to get the information that the people of this province deserve to have. That's why we're going to bring in a performance agreement that will have much more transparency, much more oversight, Speaker—and we will bring in legislation that will provide for a patient advocate at Ornge. It will—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Mr. Speaker, it's not about taking responsibility for fixing the problem; it's about taking responsibility for creating it in the first place. Twenty-five million dollars of money diverted from front-line health care are missing, and the minister has no answers.

Sadly, that's only one of an endless number of examples. Last week it came to light that family members of Ornge executives quickly rose through the ranks, and Ornge is still paying for one of those family members' \$90,000 MBA. Why is it that when there's a choice between helping well-connected insiders and investing in front-line care, well-connected insiders always win with this Liberal government?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, that's an allegation that I simply must take exception to. However, let me talk a little bit more about what I heard when I spoke to front-line paramedics and pilots and those people who maintain our aircraft.

They are enormously dedicated, well-trained, passionate people who are doing a great service for all of us. I can tell you that they are very pleased that they are now being heard. They are very, very pleased with the changes they are seeing, the changes in direction, the changes in policy. They are enormously optimistic about the future of Ornge. They want to do their jobs. They had felt stifled in that, Speaker, in the past. But even in the short time that we have had new leadership at Ornge, they are feeling very optimistic about the future, and I want them to know that we are listening and we are responding.

#### SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** My question is to the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs.

**Interjection:** Is this on rebroadcast you got during the campaign?

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I'd like to talk about that sometime.

The supply management sectors of agriculture are a major economic driver in our province, helping keep our rural communities strong and vibrant. The federal government has dismantled the Canadian Wheat Board and

has stated they're putting everything on the table when they're negotiating the new Trans-Pacific Partnership, a new trading bloc including the United States and Japan. This has farmers and the supply management people in Peterborough extremely worried.

The supply management system has a proven track record of protecting Ontario producers, as well as processors and consumers, from extreme market fluctuation. Could you please provide the House with an update on the province's position on the future of supply management in Ontario?

**Hon. Ted McMeekin:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for that great question. He's absolutely right: Supply management has in fact stood the test of time. It has led to both enhanced stability and prosperity in the agricultural sector. So this government continues to be strong supporters of the supply management system because we understand that it's the very best way to manage several significant sectors of our agricultural economy.

There was a House resolution, too, by the way, I think, when the last government articulated this. That was forwarded to the federal government. I think, by the way, that resolution of the Legislative Assembly has had some significant impact with respect to the attitudes evolving from the federal government.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I want to thank the minister for that very comprehensive and detailed answer. It's good to hear that our supply-managed farmers can have confidence that the government of Ontario is in their corner. Can you tell us what steps Ontario has taken to show support for our supply management commodities?

**Hon. Ted McMeekin:** I was so caught up in the compliment, Mr. Speaker, that I didn't catch the whole supplementary, but I think the spirit is very, very clear.

We count on our agricultural sector, which is one of the most significant and successful sectors of our entire economy, to be there when we need them, and I think the agricultural sector deserves nothing less than to know that this government will be with them when they're needed as well. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of our record. I'm proud of the people in the agricultural community, who produce so much; who produce the best products, the most nutritious products and the safest food anywhere in the world.

1110

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** My question is to the Premier. Speaker, the Premier insists that the Minister of Health should not be held responsible for her lack of oversight of our air ambulance service because she was lied to. While that may be the case, the performance agreement between the Ministry of Health and Ornge clearly states that the ministry, on behalf of the government, had a standards-enforcement and oversight role over the not-for-profit ambulance service of this province. The minister was reminded of that oversight role more than a

year ago in that document that she received, and yet, no oversight was ever exercised on the part of the Ministry of Health over that ambulance service. We want to know: Why not, Mr. Premier?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Health.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I think that there is complete agreement that the original performance agreement did not give us the tools we needed to provide the oversight. The Auditor General himself has indicated that the old performance agreement was not strong enough, and he is advocating for a strengthened performance agreement. Unfortunately, one of the provisions of the old agreement was that we could cancel the contract with them, but it was a three-year process.

So clearly, the performance agreement was not strong enough. That is why we are moving forward with a new one, with much stronger oversight. It will require the ministry to approve any change in the corporate structure so this will not happen again.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Speaker, what the minister has just proven is that she has never read that agreement and she doesn't know what's in it. The fact of the matter is that that performance agreement did not give oversight over the for-profit entities. It very clearly states that it does have oversight over the not-for-profit sector of the air ambulance service.

My question is this: That briefing document of more than a year ago was copied to the Premier's principal secretary and two of the Premier's policy advisors: the three most trusted advisors to the Premier. It was also copied to the Deputy Ministers of Finance, Health, Infrastructure, Economic Development and Trade and the director of emergency health services. Not one person amongst that entire list clued into the fact that this organization was out of control and that someone in the chain of command should sound the alarm.

I ask the Premier again: If he doesn't want to hold the Minister of Health accountable, who will be held accountable?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Member from Oxford, come to order.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I accept full responsibility for fixing the problem that has been revealed, Speaker.

I do have the performance agreement here. It's 150 pages long, and what I can tell you is that the Auditor General—the member from Newmarket–Aurora might not trust me on this, but I do believe he trusts the Auditor General—is advocating for a much stronger new performance agreement. He is on record as saying the existing one does not give the required oversight. I'll take it from the Auditor General before I'll take it from the member from Newmarket–Aurora any day.

## NUCLEAR POWER FACILITIES

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** My question is for the Minister of Energy. Ontario hydro bills are skyrocketing due to

everything from the politically motivated cancellation of gas-fired power plants to the costly and deeply flawed smart meters. A report released last week by the widely respected SECOR Group says that the cost of building and operating idle and underutilized power plants is \$1.5 billion per year.

Minister, can you explain why this government is proceeding with two new nuclear units at Darlington when there's such an oversupply here in Ontario?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** Thank you very much. Speaker, we're determined to have the reliable energy that families, farms and businesses need: clean, reliable energy. We know where we were in 2003: burning coal; lights out; diesel generators on the street corners. The people of Ontario have been working hard the last eight years to rebuild the system. Unfortunately, that has a cost. That has a cost for work that wasn't done during the time of the two opposite parties. But families have been doing that work. We've got a reliable, clean system that is supporting good jobs in Ontario and placing us well for the good jobs in clean energy in the future.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** Well, it's very clear that this minister can't defend the numbers—it is very clear. An extra \$1.5 billion annually in unnecessary charges to home energy bills: That adds \$100 a year to the typical home energy bill, all because of the cost of selling surplus energy at below-cost prices and operating unused and underutilized hydro plants. Now this government wants to add billions to our hydro bills by proceeding with the unnecessary Darlington reactors.

Why does this government, why does this minister insist on sending our hydro bills through the roof by building these unnecessary plants?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** As I say, affordability is absolutely something we're focused on, as is reliability. We have been rebuilding the transmission system: over 5,000 kilometres of line. We've been bringing on the generation that the party opposite allowed to slip away. We're making sure that families, farms and businesses have the reliable source they need. Nuclear has long been part of that power, and we're determined to make sure that we have a stable source of baseload power, of which nuclear has been a part; it's about 50% now. If my friend had his way, maybe he'd turn off half the lights and shut down half the jobs. We're determined not to do that, not to kill the 80,000 jobs in the province of Ontario, which are the best nuclear power system in the world.

## ENERGY POLICIES

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** My question is for the Minister of Energy. With the FIT two-year review well under way in the province, many of my constituents want to see a prosperous microFIT program that can help farmers participate in clean energy but at the same time earn extra income. I know that farmers who are participating in the clean energy economy are able to earn up to \$10,000 a

year from clean energy. This is helping them and the Ontario economy.

Minister, what is being done to ensure that the microFIT program will continue to benefit Ontario's economy and support farmers?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** I want to thank the member from Ottawa-Orléans specifically for the question, because he recognizes, as we all do, that farmers have long been great stewards of the land, and very protective of the environment. It is their future; it is our future.

Farmers across this province have embraced green energy and they have embraced the microFIT program. They have recognized that they can not only contribute to us getting out of coal, protecting the environment and cleaning the air, but they can earn funds at the same time from participating in the microFIT program. For example, Dick Netherway, a Vineland farmer, has recognized that the microFIT program is a very stable source of revenue.

It's the coming together: clean energy, clean energy jobs, cleaning up the environment. We're working together, supporting our farmers. Why won't the party opposite do the same?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** Thank you, Minister. I know that my constituents are pleased to hear that Ontario farmers are a priority for this government.

In addition to farmers, community groups and families are also benefiting from Ontario's clean energy economy. Not only are they able to participate through microFIT projects, many of them are also seeing other economic benefits from projects being built across this great province.

As projects are constructed, there are numerous companies and skilled workers whose services are needed to complete the projects. This is supporting jobs and economic activity in communities across our province.

Minister, can you please tell us about the clean energy supply chain and the various industries that are benefiting from clean energy in Ontario?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** You know, my friend is absolutely right: As we clean up the air and bring on clean energy, we're making sure that we create jobs right here in the province of Ontario—20,000 jobs already; on track for 50,000.

Another report identifies Ontario as one of the top seven countries in the world for clean, green energy companies. Just think, Speaker: These jobs affect every part of Ontario. They affect farmers, archaeological technicians, acoustic engineers, field technicians, drill crews, environmental engineers.

1120

The party opposite talks about apprenticeships, but apprenticing for what? You won't support the very jobs they'd be apprenticing at in order to become journeymen. It's time the party opposite stood up for the jobs in the province of Ontario.

## AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** New question? The member from Thornhill.

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** Thank you very much, Speaker—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Members on both sides would do better not to yell. And, second of all, the member from Thornhill has the floor, and I wish his own members would not heckle while he's trying to ask the question.

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** Thank you, Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Premier, we have brought to your attention serious accountability and oversight failures of your government and your Minister of Health with respect to Ornge.

Let me remind you of your own words back in 2000 when you were in opposition and questioning a minister of the crown: "Now you are telling us that you weren't aware in any way, shape or form of some very substantive work that was being done on your watch by your ministry officials, a very far-reaching and ambitious plan? Why do you get the extra money? Why do you have the car? Why do you have the driver? Why have you got the job? Why have you got the title if you can't even keep track of what's going on inside your own ministry? I ask you, then, if you don't know this is going on, then why don't you just resign?"

Premier, will you apply those same standards—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Premier?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, as you unsurprisingly know, I will not. Just—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member is warned.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** So things have changed?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** If we might be factual, the minister has indicated, I think several times over now, that we did not bring the necessary oversight to bear, that the original agreement was not strong enough—

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** So you've changed your view on accountability?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I gave you a warning, in the middle of that. You're named.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** That's not good either.

*Mr. Yakabuski was escorted from the chamber.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I want to tell all the House: When I warn, it's one.

Premier.

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** As I was saying, the minister has made it very clear that the original oversight was inadequate, that we failed to bring the necessary accountability measures to bear. She has taken, I believe, decisive and diligent steps. We have brought in a team of forensic accountants. We have turned the matter over to

the Ontario Provincial Police. We're going to be bringing in tougher rules by way of new legislation. I believe that's the responsible thing to do, and the minister will keep acting responsibly, I'm sure.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** It is clear from the Premier's answer that this government specializes in looking the other way. The Ornge issue is not the only example.

How can Ontarians trust in anything that this government does when the Premier will not hold his cabinet to the same standards that he has outlined for others? His Minister of Health did not do her job in overseeing Ornge.

I ask the Premier again: Will he do the decent thing? Will he hold his cabinet to the standards he has demanded of others? When will he demand his Minister of Health resign?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** I can appreciate that while acceding to my honourable colleague's request would serve his political interests, I think our responsibility here is to stand for the public interest, and I draw the distinction between the political interest of the party opposite and the public interest, which we are required to uphold here in government.

What does the public interest demand in these circumstances? I would argue it demands a couple of things, very importantly: Number one, ensure that the minister takes all necessary steps to ensure that this does not repeat itself, and if any money has been lost, to recapture that money so that it's back in public hands; secondly, to ensure that this minister continues to execute our health care action plan. It's a very big undertaking. This minister has acquired a tremendous amount of information. She's moving with passion and energy to carry out her responsibilities.

## WASTE REDUCTION

**Mr. Jonah Schein:** This question is to the Minister of the Environment. Today there's another news story on how the McGuinty government is continuing to drop the ball on environmental protection, allowing hazardous, waste-producing companies to pass the cost of disposal on to consumers and taxpayers; allowing retailers to charge consumers different eco fees for the same product; and falling far short of the targets for waste reductions that have been promised. When will the government finally fix its waste-reduction programs and stop making Ontarians pick up the bill for polluting companies?

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Some day I'll ask the NDP critic what his stance is on this, because it's rather interesting to see that you would ask this question at a time when there are people out there, some on one side, who would say that municipalities should pick up the tab. That's something we should perhaps ask the Rural Ontario Municipal Association about, what they think of the Conservative plan to download the cost of that to municipalities.

But I can tell the member that we have made some significant changes. I am dissatisfied with the rate of diversion that I have seen over the years. I'm determined to see that rate of diversion increase dramatically, and I would say to the member, and I think he might agree with this, that producers should assume any cost there would be of diverting that waste from landfills in the province.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Jonah Schein:** The government tries to put a Band-Aid on its failed waste-reduction policy every few months, instead of admitting that its approach of letting industry police itself simply doesn't work. Without strong government oversight and enforceable targets, companies will never willingly pay the cost of their hazardous products.

In 2009, the government launched a badly needed review of its waste-reduction act. Will the government finally release the results of this review and get on with making polluters pay?

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Well, I can tell the member that we're already working on that. For instance, one of the circumstances that existed out there that I think caused some problems was the fact that people were projecting what the costs might be for those who were dealing with these products. I have given instructions that that change, through Waste Diversion Ontario, so that the actual cost be charged to those individuals.

But let's look at the total costs that are assessed to people. If you're a company, you don't say on the bill that the minimum wage went up, so we're going to put that on the bill and charge an extra charge. You don't say that the transportation costs increased, so therefore, as a result of that, we're going to place that on a bill and ding consumers with it. You don't say that if you have to put on a piece of pollution-abatement equipment, you're going to put that on an additional bill and force them to pay for it. That cost should be assumed by the producers of these products in the province of Ontario—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

## ACCESSIBILITY FOR THE DISABLED

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** My question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services.

About one in seven people in Ontario have a disability, and it's anticipated to grow to one in five within 20 years due to our aging population. By 2036, the number of seniors is projected to be more than double the 2009 number of 4.7 million.

The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, passed by our government in 2005, continues to help create inclusion for everyone in Ontario, regardless of their abilities. Through you, Speaker, to the minister: Can you tell this House what the AODA does to help Ontario be more inclusive?

**Hon. John Milloy:** I thank the member for his question. Members of this House should be very proud of the

AODA, which was passed unanimously by the Legislature in 2005. As members may know, the AODA is the first of its kind in the world, a modern regulatory regime in terms of accessibility, in terms of replacing a complaint-based process that we see in other jurisdictions. What we've done is reach out to talk to individuals with disabilities, people from all sectors of society, and come together with standards that we want to see adopted between 2005 and 2025.

January 1 of this year, the customer service standard went into place for businesses throughout the province of Ontario. What it calls on them to do is have a cultural change, where they try to think about and work with their employees to make sure that they are a more welcome and accessible business.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** Thank you, Minister. I've heard from businesses in my riding of Don Valley East that they have some concerns about the costs associated with becoming more accessible. Through you, Speaker, to the minister: Can you explain how businesses can comply and what the economic benefits are for businesses that provide accessible services?

1130

**Hon. John Milloy:** As I mentioned in my first question, the standards that came into effect on January 1 this year were developed in full consultation and participation with the business community. Business owners know that making their store—their place of work, what have you—accessible is good in the sense of corporate social responsibility, but it's also good for the bottom line. There are, as was mentioned by the member, literally hundreds of thousands of people with disabilities in the province of Ontario, and businesses want to make sure that they are welcoming to those people so that they can frequent their business.

A recent study by the Martin Prosperity Institute said that making Ontario more accessible could bring in improvements of about \$1.6 billion in tourism dollars, and retail sales could grow by another close to \$10 billion.

## HOME WARRANTY PROGRAM

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** My question is to the Minister of Consumer Services. Too many Ontarians continue to discover heating, ventilation and air-conditioning construction defects in their newly built homes.

Tarion administers the Ontario new home warranty plan to ensure consumer protection against these problems. Nevertheless, new homeowners are often left to address these problems themselves. Tarion is ultimately accountable to your ministry, Minister. You have known about this systemic problem for years and you have done nothing to resolve it. Why are you leaving new homeowners unprotected?

**Hon. Margaret R. Best:** First of all, let me take this opportunity to welcome Canadians for Properly Built Homes to Queen's Park this morning.

Tarion's role, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that new homeowners in Ontario receive the new home warranty protection which they are entitled to by law. Tarion has an important responsibility: It is there to ensure that builders abide by the Ontario New Home Warranties Plan Act and steps in to protect consumers when builders fail to fulfill their warranty obligations.

Over the years, Mr. Speaker, Tarion has paid out over \$190 million in claims from its guarantee fund and has one of the most comprehensive new home warranty programs in North America.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** We know what Tarion is supposed to do; what we're telling the minister is that they're not doing it.

The Ontario Ombudsman noted in his 2008 report that "while the ministry declines to intervene in individual cases, it has addressed systemic issues that have been raised through its oversight of Tarion." Since that report, Tarion has established the New Home Buyer Ombuds-person Office. Even so, this consumer concern persists, and your response to the systemic problem has been inadequate to non-existent.

Minister, to ensure new homeowners are being adequately protected, will you commission a full investigation today and finally, after 10 years, put this issue to rest?

**Hon. Margaret R. Best:** Mr. Speaker, let me assure the member opposite that Ontario consumers are a priority for the Ministry of Consumer Services and our government. Mr. Speaker, also let me assure you that we have looked at the concerns that have been raised with the CPBH president. He contacted us. We are certainly in the process of responding to those concerns that have been raised.

We continue to provide, through the Ontario New Home Warranties Plan Act, the steps and protection for consumers. We know there are some issues that have to be addressed, Mr. Speaker, and we continue to look into these issues with a plan to respond to them accordingly.

## MANUFACTURING JOBS

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** My question is to the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. Families in Niagara are worried about jobs. In 2010, this government promised a million dollars in a grant to New Food Classics in Niagara, a packaged foods company which would create more jobs in the region of Niagara.

But last week, this company once again went into receivership and locked its workers out. When the government handed this money out, did it extract any job guarantees?

**Hon. Ted McMeekin:** Mr. Speaker, we were very, very pleased as a government to help New Food Classics. They were a Calgary company that had an idea, a good idea, that they wanted to invest in Ontario. I don't know if the member opposite knows this, but there is a process that's in place to review applications and to do due

diligence. The company provided their information in good faith, and we did the due diligence analysis in good faith. And as fate would have it, sometimes these things don't work out.

I think it's important for us to always footnote and lament the loss of jobs any time something like this happens. But what we never want to lament is being willing to stand with and take the occasional risk when we have good reason to believe it's going to benefit the people of Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** Government financial statements show the province gave this company \$900,000 last year. That was supposedly in return for the company relocating from Calgary and creating new jobs. But now, once again, in Niagara, 120 workers are out of work.

Kate Jones, the unit plant chair, said, "We made a lot of concessions. And I'd ... like to know where that \$1 million went."

Can the minister answer Kate's question? Where did that money go, Minister?

**Hon. Ted McMeekin:** I'm pleased to say that our ministry continues to be in some discussion with New Food Classics.

You may or may not know that New Food Classics replaced a firm that, prior to their arrival, had gone bankrupt. It's always a possibility that when we talk—when there are some difficulties and you continue the dialogue—that we may be able either to find a way to see New Food Classics continue or perhaps find a successor company to come in. So those are the kinds of conversations we're having.

I know the member opposite wants to help with economic development, and I appreciate her question. There are two other ways that she and her party opposite can help us. You can support our new healthy homes credit bill, and you can also support the creation of the southwest economic development fund.

#### FAMILY CAREGIVER LEAVE

**Ms. Soo Wong:** My question is for the Minister of Labour. Minister, I often hear from constituents who are concerned about important issues affecting their work life, issues that are near and dear to them. The health and well-being of family members is one of the common concerns for many of the people in my riding. These constituents need to take time away from work to take care of their loved ones who are ill or injured.

Minister, what is your ministry doing to help those workers—who need to take time to take care of family members with illnesses—in juggling their work?

**Hon. Linda Jeffrey:** I'd like to thank the member from Scarborough—Agincourt for the question. When somebody you love is sick or hurt, the last thing you're thinking about is work. We understand the need to be there for a loved one when they need our care and support. That's why we introduced legislation last week that would, if passed, give employees up to eight weeks

of unpaid, job-protected time away from work to provide care to support a sick or injured member of their family.

The new family caregiver leave would build on the existing family medical leave so that, whether a young child spends time in hospital or an elderly parent suffers a broken hip, family members would be granted extended time to care for and support their loved ones.

We want to give working Ontarians the one thing they need the most when it comes to caring for somebody who is seriously ill or injured: time—time to be with their loved ones.

Our proposed family caregiver leave is a matter of compassion, and it's the right thing to do for Ontario families.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** There being no—sorry.

**Mr. Todd Smith:** A point of order.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Prince Edward—Hastings.

**Mr. Todd Smith:** Thank you. Speaker, a point of order pursuant to standing order 23(h), which is the making of allegations against another member: The Premier, very early on in our proceedings here this morning, alleged that a request was made for a new racetrack in Belleville.

As the provincial representative for the city of Belleville, the question that I submitted to the ministry reads as follows: "Would the minister explain the cause for delay of the proposed racetrack and OLG slot machine facility planned for Belleville? It was six?"—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I thank the member for his point of order. I didn't hear anything unparliamentary. Thank you.

#### CORRECTION OF RECORD

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** On a point of order, Speaker: Earlier, I referred to the member from Kitchener. I should have said "the member from Kitchener—Waterloo." Thank you.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** That is a point of order, and to correct her own record is the normal procedure. Thank you.

There have been no deferred votes. This House stands recessed until 1 p.m. this afternoon.

*The House recessed from 1140 to 1300.*

#### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Ms. Tracy MacCharles:** I would like to acknowledge Julia Frampton from the Chronic Pain Group who'll be joining us shortly. She's here with her mother today and others from that organization to help raise awareness of this important group.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** I want to introduce a Chilean friend of mine, Jose Aylwin, who is here. He's a human rights lawyer with specialization in indigenous people and citizens' rights in Latin America. He acts as the co-

director of the Observatorio Ciudadano, Citizens' Watch, an NGO aimed at the promotion and protection of human rights in Chile. He also teaches indigenous peoples' rights at the school of law of the Universidad Austral de Chile. He's here to make stronger connections with Canadian friends working in the same field. I want to welcome him here to Toronto and Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** We do welcome our guests. Thank you for your work.

#### RAIL ACCIDENT

**Hon. John Milloy:** Mr. Speaker, I believe we have unanimous consent that up to three minutes be allocated to each party to speak to yesterday's tragic train accident in Burlington.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Do we have unanimous consent? Agreed.

The House leader.

**Hon. John Milloy:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my honour to rise in the House today to convey my sincerest condolences and those of the Premier and the entire government to the families and co-workers of the three Via Rail employees who lost their lives and those who were injured in the train derailment in Burlington yesterday. Our thoughts and prayers go out to the Simmonds, Snarr and Robinson families and to their friends and colleagues.

I also want to thank our first responders for their dedication, bravery and professionalism shown at the scene of the accident: Firefighters from the Burlington Fire Department, Halton Regional Police officers and emergency medical services personnel, along with railway personnel, all showed their bravery and professionalism when it counts the most. Passengers were freed from the wreckage, the injured were triaged on-site, and those most in danger were airlifted to hospital or transported by ambulances.

This rescue effort was made possible by the many responders involved: air ambulance pilots and paramedics, officers from the Ontario Provincial Police, nurses and doctors from the nearby hospitals who treated the wounded, and Red Cross volunteers who comforted passengers by trackside.

The work of these first responders is absolutely vital in ensuring that our patients get the support and care they need right away.

Ontarians can be proud of their response during this difficult time. Everyone showed what we all know to be the true nature and spirit of Ontarians. When disaster strikes, as Ontarians we all pull together and help each other.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government of Ontario, on behalf of Premier McGuinty, I want to express my deepest sympathies to the families of those affected by this tragedy and also express a very deep thank you and expression of appreciation on behalf of the government for all those who worked so tirelessly to deal with the rescue effort. It was a tragedy which has hit

international proportions, but as Ontarians, I think we should very be proud of the effort that was put together to deal with this remarkably horrible situation.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Burlington.

**Mrs. Jane McKenna:** Speaker, on behalf of the Legislative Assembly and the Ontario PC caucus, I would like to extend deepest sympathies to all Via passengers, staff and their families touched by yesterday's derailment of train 92.

We are very thankful for the skills and compassion of our first responders. They eased suffering on a terrible day.

Railways like the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railway built this country. They run so deeply in our identity as Canadians that it is impossible to imagine being Canadian without trains.

If they are the past, they are also the future. Train travel is increasingly seen as a sustainable form of transportation and a civilized way of getting from A to B. Train travel is becoming more popular with each passing year. Ridership grows as fuel prices climb and travellers consider alternate modes of transport. For all that back and forth, trains are still a very safe mode of travel, safer on balance than travelling by car.

But as safe as trains are, they are not absolutely safe. At 3:28 p.m. Sunday afternoon, while en route from Niagara Falls to Toronto, Via train 92 left the tracks just east of Aldershot, in my riding of Burlington. We were immediately reminded that train travel still carries risk and that this is still a line of work where those who work on trains face real and serious danger every day.

Sadly, the three Via Rail engineers who were in the locomotive at the time of the accident lost their lives yesterday. Our thoughts and prayers go out to their families in this trying time.

There was one locomotive and five cars on train 92; all of them derailed. The train was carrying 75 people when it left the tracks. There were numerous injuries to passengers and the two other Via crew members. Three passengers were airlifted to hospital with serious injuries; 42 other passengers and one crew member were taken by ambulance to local hospitals, hospitals such as Joseph Brant Memorial Hospital, Hamilton General Hospital, St. Joe's hospital and Trillium Health Centre. Several of the injured have since been released.

We are never so thankful for the medical experts of the Golden Horseshoe than when tragedy strikes. Local police, fire department and emergency services responded quickly and with exceptional skill. The caring of victim services and Red Cross volunteers were also a key part of the exceptional community response to this disaster.

While at this point little is known about what happened in the Burlington derailment, we do know that it was a multi-track area used daily by GO Transit, CN Rail and Via Rail. Some reporters have noted that the Via Rail derailment site is near a crossover and within 100 metres of the site of a derailment four years ago this month. In

that derailment a freight train skidded off the lines, derailling 19 cars and tankers and creating chaos.

That said, the exact cause or causes of the train 92 accident is currently under investigation. Officials have already begun to investigate the accident in concert with local authorities and CN, the track owner, and in collaboration with the Transportation Safety Board of Canada in its enquiry.

We eagerly await their findings so that we can take measures to ensure that this kind of tragedy is not repeated. We continue to extend our wishes, prayers and deepest sympathies to all of those whose lives have been touched by yesterday's tragic, tragic event.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Timmins—James Bay.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** I rise on behalf of the New Democratic caucus and our leader, Andrea Horwath, to echo the comments that have been made just now and earlier today in the chamber. When the party leaders did their lead-off questions, everybody took the time to talk about this tragedy.

You know, you don't expect those kinds of things to happen in our country. You normally expect to see that in the paper, headlines about something somewhere else. We have become so accustomed to the safety records of our Via system and our airplane system that it's almost a complete shock because you don't expect it to happen. I know when I found out yesterday afternoon, my immediate reaction was, "Oh, it had to be somewhere else. It wasn't in Ontario." And I think that speaks to professionalism of the people who work in system and the people involved in making sure that we have a safe system.

That being said, an accident and a tragedy happened, and we need to make sure that the investigation uncovers what it is that happened. It was alluded to before that there was an accident in this particular area barely four years ago. So is there a connection with the equipment—not so much the equipment but the trackage—in that particular area? I'm sure that the Canadian Transportation Safety Board will look into those matters in order to determine what needs to be done so that this particular tragedy doesn't happen again.

1310

To those who went to work that morning and didn't get home: Unfortunately, in this province that happens. Everyone from miners to police officers to taxi drivers to you name it has a risk sometimes when they go to work. And nobody expects the morning that you go to work it's going to be your last day and you're not going to be coming back home. So our heart goes out to those families who have lost their loved ones as a result of doing what they love, and that is going to work. Who wouldn't want to be a train engineer? That's obviously a dream that we've always had as young 'uns, as they say.

To the passengers: You know, I heard stories told by some of the amazing co-operation, not only of our fire services, ambulance services and others, but how the people on the train themselves were actually the first

responders. It reminds us of the degree of our humanity: that people even in the face of danger are able to face that danger and not care so much about their own safety, but to try to make the situation better for others. So I think we need to say to those, our hats are off to you, because as fellow citizens, we hope that's what we would be able to do as well.

To those who were injured, luckily we do have a good health care system and we do have a good system of being able to move people from hospital to hospital and do what has to be done. Those first responders are professional; they train for these kinds of things. In fact, just last week in my own constituency in Timmins—James Bay the Canadian military was doing an exercise in order to train up our first responders if there would be an airplane accident in our vicinity. They simulated an airplane accident in Cochrane and another one in Hearst, and the whole idea was to train not only the military but more to challenge our first responders and our hospital system to be able to be ready for such a tragedy, should it happen. So when we see these types of exercises going on, we know now, when we see what happened yesterday, that there's a correlation between the two.

So our heart goes out to those who are the survivors, who are going to have to live with the tragedy of this. And we hope that we're going to be able together to move forward to find out what happened and to make sure that this type of tragedy never happens again. Merci.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** To the House leaders, to the members here who provided unanimous consent, to the members who gave their wonderful message, I'm grateful and I know the people of Ontario are grateful, particularly those involved. So on behalf of all of us, I submit to those individuals our deep-felt gratitude and thanks and our prayers. Thank you, all members.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** Speaker, I'd like to point out that today at lunch, over 80 school buses circled this Legislature in support of the Coulter Osborne report being released.

It's another McGuinty promise that has been broken by allowing a moratorium on the flawed RFP process to come to an end before the recommendations from the Coulter Osborne report are made public. The minister has had this report since January 26.

In my riding, the Thames Valley District School Board has motioned concerns about the legal issues with regard to the RFP due to the delay in the release of the report. It also has issues with the consortia's governance and issues with the RFP in general.

I stand here today to call upon the government to not break another promise. Give the school bus operators some clarity and release the Coulter Osborne report.

## RIDING OF DAVENPORT

**Mr. Jonah Schein:** Davenport has a long and vibrant history and to this day it remains a terrific place to walk, to shop, to dine or drink espresso on a patio. Its merchants are proud of this history and they bring passion and commitment to their commercial endeavours. They lovingly care for their stores and their storefronts and they genuinely care about our community.

As I settle into my new role as the MPP for this great riding in Toronto's west end, I've had the good fortune to meet with numerous community groups and individuals who share my passion and my commitment for this community.

I've heard from hundreds of shop owners who are hurting, though. Toronto is very expensive and small businesses pay some of the highest commercial taxes in the GTA and small shops struggle to compete with the big box stores and the retail giants.

Too many storefronts in my riding now stand empty and each shop that closes makes it harder for its neighbour to stay alive. Too many merchants tell me that they don't know how much longer they can keep their doors open or their lights on.

I want to honour the rich history in our riding and the many small business owners who have had to close their doors and I want to recognize the small business owners who bravely carry on. BIAs like St. Clair Gardens and Fairbank are making huge contributions to our neighbourhoods. They're working hard to beautify our street-scapes, to organize street festivals and events, and they will ultimately help bring prosperity back to streets like St. Clair and Eglinton Avenue.

Davenport small businesses and BIAs are doing their part to bring back life to our communities, but they need the help of the provincial government, and we need the provincial government to reinvest in our cities and to support the small businesses that create jobs and make prosperous neighbourhoods.

## ACTION ONTARIO

**Ms. Helena Jaczek:** Today I would like to bring recognition to Action Ontario and the several hard-working and dedicated members who are here with us today.

Action Ontario seeks to increase awareness about chronic pain and discuss the need for a comprehensive pain strategy in Ontario. Chronic pain is an escalating health problem affecting 20% to 30% of all Canadians. Types of chronic pain include neuropathic pain, arthritis, fibromyalgia, back pain and headaches. It has been estimated that chronic pain costs Ontario's health care system approximately \$2.1 billion per year in direct medical expenses and an additional \$13 billion in productivity costs from job losses and sick days.

Action Ontario is an innovative, non-profit organization that provides a voice for people living with all forms of chronic pain. Doctors, researchers, health care

professionals and patients are committed to increasing awareness and improving the diagnosis and care of people with all forms of chronic pain. I encourage all members of this House to meet with representatives from Action Ontario to hear about their initiatives.

I want to thank Dr. Angela Mailis-Gagnon, a constituent of mine in Oak Ridges–Markham and the chairperson of Action Ontario, as well as all the volunteers at Action Ontario for the work they are doing on behalf of Ontarians suffering from pain.

## SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION

**Mr. Randy Pettapiece:** Today we welcome the Ontario Independent School Bus Operators Association. They're here because the McGuinty government's RFP policy still threatens the livelihoods of school bus operators in Perth–Wellington and across Ontario. They are small business owners, they drive children to school, and they drive our local economy.

In good faith, they have negotiated contracts with school boards under a process that has worked. What doesn't work is the McGuinty government's RFP process. Their policy ignores independent operators' many years of cost-effective service, and it ignores what's most important: their long history of transporting children safely. That's what John Chapman and his company have done, and that's what Sandi Ahrens and her company have done. They employ local people. Their drivers know our communities. They know the children that they drive to school and back each day.

The RFP moratorium expired December 31, and now independent school bus operators are left in limbo. Twice I have written the Minister of Education on this issue. More than two months after sending my first letter, I have yet to see a response. The minister has run out of excuses. We call on her to stop hiding the task force recommendations from the public. We call on her to fix her failed policy.

## BUTCH WINDSOR

**Mr. Michael Prue:** I rise today to commemorate the life of Butch Windsor. Late last fall, Butch died. He served our community wisely and well for many, many years, and many considered him to be one of the true heroes of Beaches–East York.

He succumbed to cancer, and it took many, many years for the cancer to win. He survived treatment after treatment, but unfortunately in the end that relentless disease got the better of him.

His funeral was attended by hundreds and hundreds of people, and a few weeks later the community held a memorial to commemorate him again, and again it was packed to overflowing in the community centre at Crescent Town.

Butch was a real fixture in our community. He was a man who was at every single community event. Last week, I went to a community event in Crescent Town,

International Mother Language Day, and looked around to see if he was there, because it was hard to believe you could go to such an event without seeing him.

He was renowned for his work with the Crescent Town tenants, and for his work on the Crescent Town Club and in the Flemington legal services, where he advocated on behalf of everyone—advocated on behalf of those who did not have enough money, but particularly advocated on behalf of new Canadians who had come to live in the area. We will miss him greatly.

1320

#### FAIR SHARE FOR PEEL

**Mrs. Amrit Mangat:** Recently, I was pleased to attend the important event organized by the Fair Share partner agencies in my riding of Mississauga–Brampton South. The purpose was to recognize a new investment by our government of \$3.6 million for mental health and addiction services in Peel region. The new funding is based on Peel region's share of Ontario's population, which is home to 11.5% of the children and youth in Ontario. The new funding allocation will reflect that reality.

This is great news for Peel region. I'm pleased to be part of a government that has addressed the concerns of Peel region and delivered this change in funding.

I congratulate the Peel Children's Centre, Nexus Youth Services, Rapport Youth and Family Services and Associated Youth Services of Peel for their continued hard work towards bringing a positive change in the lives of children and youth of Peel region.

#### SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION

**Mr. Todd Smith:** I rise today to get answers for my constituents. Hastings county and the Quinte area have been a battleground for independent school bus operators for the last couple of years as they struggle to ensure their businesses survive through a recession that feels like it has no end.

Two years ago, Rollie Montgomery of Montgomery bus lines confronted the Premier in Brighton and asked him if he planned to continue with a process that favours large, multinational bus companies over smaller, independent operators. The Premier told Rollie during that picnic that he didn't want to see small bus operators go out of business.

Today the Premier and his education minister are sitting on the Coulter Osborne report. These independent operators want answers now. They want to know if this Premier will have them picking up students or welfare cheques, as Rollie once said.

The Premier has never hesitated to protect his friends in public sector unions, but he has also never hesitated to ignore rural Ontario if it suited his purpose. Many of these small, independent school bus operators serve rural communities like mine in Stirling, Marmora, Bancroft and McArthur Mills. He may be Premier Dad in Toronto but he's a deadbeat dad in rural Ontario—

#### *Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I suspect the member knows that that's not parliamentary, and I'll ask him to withdraw it.

**Mr. Todd Smith:** Withdrawn.

As the small business critic for the official opposition, I'm calling on the Premier and his education minister to release the Coulter Osborne report now and protect rural Ontario small businesses and private sector jobs.

#### HEALTHY HOMES RENOVATION TAX CREDIT

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** Last week, the Ontario Legislature passed second reading of the long-awaited Ontario healthy homes renovation tax credit. This tax credit will assist seniors with some of the costs of home improvements to help them age comfortably in their homes. The annual \$1,500 credit will, if passed, enable older adults to offset some of the costs of such upgrades as a chair lift, where climbing the stairs is difficult, or of a walk-in shower or tub to prevent falls.

In addition to putting home renovation jobs at risk, the PC Party opposition imperils vulnerable seniors and those with disabilities. Why expose seniors to greater risk of overcrowding and longer and unnecessary waits for hospitals or long-term care when they can age where they want to be, which is at home?

One PC member even dismissed the benefit as "fluff." Speaker, there is no need for partisan politics or reflexive, right-wing ideology when it comes to helping seniors.

Ontarians everywhere, and especially older adults, are hoping that all members from all parties will put the interests of the people who elected them first and pass this important tax credit in the weeks to come.

#### CHILD SAFETY

**Mrs. Jane McKenna:** Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak about a case that was reported in the Toronto Sun on the weekend. It's a case that appears to be about a basic question of values and leadership: A young father and his family were shown a serious lack of respect and consideration by people in their community, people who are supposed to protect and support families.

A kindergarten student, a four-year-old, draws a picture of a man holding a gun. The teacher shows it to the principal, who calls Child and Family Services and the local police. The father of five arrives at the school to pick up his children and is immediately detained by the police, taken to the station, strip-searched and questioned. His children and wife undoubtedly terrified, the children are being questioned by social workers.

Let me be perfectly clear: I understand the need for vigilance around the issue of child safety, but wouldn't it have been better to start the process with a conversation about the picture? As a mother of five, my son would run around with his little friends at the tender age of four or

five with a banana—yes, a banana—pretending it was a gun. He'd shoot the banana at his little friends and they would crumble to the ground with dramatic flair, having been running around, and then start giggling after. They're kids; they have imaginations.

I'm surprised that, prior to taking the most extreme course of action available to them, not one of these agencies in government took a moment to talk with the father and children. I would like guarantees that this government will be taking steps to ensure that Ontario parents will be presumed innocent until proven guilty and not the other way around.

## MOTIONS

### COMMITTEE SITTINGS

**Hon. John Milloy:** Mr. Speaker, I move that the following schedule for committee meetings be established for the 40th Parliament:

The Standing Committee on Justice Policy may meet on Thursday mornings to 10:25 a.m. and Thursday afternoons following routine proceedings.

The Standing Committee on Social Policy may meet on Monday and Tuesday afternoons following routine proceedings.

The Standing Committee on General Government may meet on Monday and Wednesday afternoons following routine proceedings.

The Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs may meet on Thursday mornings to 10:25 a.m. and Thursday afternoons following routine proceedings.

The Standing Committee on Estimates may meet on Tuesday mornings to 10:25 a.m. and Tuesday and Wednesday afternoons following routine proceedings.

The Standing Committee on Government Agencies may meet on Tuesday mornings to 10:25 a.m.

The Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly may meet on Wednesday afternoons to routine proceedings.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts may meet on Wednesday mornings to 10:25 a.m. and Wednesday afternoons to routine proceedings.

The Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills may meet on Wednesday mornings to 10:25 a.m.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Mr. Milloy has moved government notice of motion 18. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*Motion agreed to.*

## PETITIONS

### AGGREGATE EXTRACTION

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Highland Companies, an American company, wants to build a quarry in Melancthon township which is to be bigger than Niagara Falls. It will be the second-largest in North America. It will be built over 200 feet (60 metres) below the water table of the headwaters that feed three major rivers. This will contaminate these rivers, which are a freshwater source for over one million people. Furthermore, the land that the quarry will be built on is some of the best farmland in Ontario. Over 50% of the GTA's potatoes are grown on this soil. The Highland Companies is under no obligation to fill in the quarry when they are finished. There is also no law stating that there must be an environmental assessment on the quarry site before it is built. This quarry will hurt the environment and affect many people, and therefore it must be stopped.

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To stop the development of the Melancthon quarry."

### SCHOOL CLOSURE

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** I submit the petition today on behalf of members of the community of Woodslee, who are continually putting out more petitions and collecting signatures to the effect of this one. I'll read it.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Windsor-Essex Catholic District School Board has begun a process to consider closing St. John the Evangelist school;

**1330**

"Whereas St. John the Evangelist school is vital to the future well-being of the Woodslee hamlet and its students; and

"Whereas schools are not just buildings for learning; they are the heart of the community;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To take whatever steps are necessary, including boundary adjustments, to keep open and maintain the long-term viability of St. John the Evangelist school."

Mr. Speaker, I agree with this petition, will affix my signature and deliver it to you via Jason.

### KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, Canada, draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to the following:

"Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada;

"Whereas real progress has been made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease, in particular the development of a bioartificial kidney;

"We, the undersigned, call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make research funding available for the explicit purpose of conducting bioartificial kidney

research as an extension to the research being successfully conducted at several centres in the United States.”

I agree with this petition, will affix my signature to it and give it to Samantha.

### HEALTH CARE FUNDING

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** A petition to restore medical labs in Tottenham, Stayner and Elmvale and reduce lineups throughout Simcoe-Grey:

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas the consolidation of medical laboratories in rural areas is causing people to travel further and wait longer for services; and

“Whereas it is the responsibility of the” McGuinty “government to ensure that Ontarians have equal access to all health care services; and

“Whereas rural Ontario continues to get shortchanged when it comes to health care: doctor shortages, smaller hospitals, less pharmaceutical services, lack of transportation and now medical laboratory services; and

“Whereas the McGuinty government continues to increase taxes to make up for misspent tax dollars, collecting \$15 billion over the last six years” from the health tax alone, “ultimately forcing Ontarians to pay more while receiving less;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“That the McGuinty government stop the erosion of public health care services” in rural Ontario and ensure timely “access to medical laboratories for all Ontarians.”

Mr. Speaker, I agree with this petition and I'll sign it.

### DIAGNOSTIC SERVICES

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** I have this petition from the people of northeastern Ontario, and it reads as follows:

“Whereas the Ontario government made PET scanning ... a publicly insured health service; and

“Whereas,” since October 2009, “insured PET scans” are performed “in Ottawa, London, Toronto, Hamilton and Thunder Bay; and

“Whereas the city of Greater Sudbury is a hub for health care in northeastern Ontario, with Health Sciences North, the regional cancer program and the Northern Ontario School of Medicine;

“We ... petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make PET scans available through Health Sciences North, thereby serving and providing equitable access to the citizens of northeastern Ontario.”

I fully support this petition, Mr. Speaker, will affix my name to it and ask page Ryan to bring it to the Clerk.

### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** “To the Legislature of Ontario:

“Whereas the current enrolment of Avalon Public School” in Orléans “is 687 students;

“Whereas the student capacity of the school is 495 students, as determined by the Ministry of Education’s own occupancy formula;

“Whereas the issue of overcrowding and lack of space makes it impossible for Avalon Public School to offer full-day kindergarten until the overcrowding issue is addressed;

“Whereas Avalon Public School is located in a high-growth community;

“Whereas the enrolment at Avalon Public School is expected to continue rising at a rate of 10% to 15% a year for the foreseeable future;

“Whereas the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board has made building a new school in Avalon a top capital priority;

“We, the undersigned, call on the province of Ontario and Ministry of Education to provide the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board with the necessary funding to build an additional school in Avalon, to open no later than September 2014.”

I support this petition and put my signature thereon and will send it up with Darren.

### RURAL SCHOOLS

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** “Petition to Save Duntroon Central Public School and All Other Rural Schools in Clearview Township.

“Whereas Duntroon Central Public School is an important part of Clearview township and the surrounding area; and

“Whereas Duntroon Central Public School is widely recognized for its high educational standards and intimate learning experience; and

“Whereas the frameworks of rural schools are different from urban schools and therefore deserve to be governed by a separate rural school policy; and

“Whereas Dalton McGuinty promised during the 2007 election that he would keep rural schools open when he declared that, ‘Rural schools help keep communities strong, which is why we’re not only committed to keeping them open—but strengthening them’; and

“Whereas” Premier “McGuinty found \$12 million to keep school swimming pools open in Toronto but hasn’t found any money to” help “keep rural schools open in Simcoe-Grey;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“That Premier Dalton McGuinty and the Minister of Education support the citizens of Clearview township and suspend the Simcoe County District School Board ARC 2010:01 until the province develops a rural school policy that recognizes the value of schools in the rural communities of Ontario.”

Mr. Speaker, I agree with this petition and I will sign it.

## SERVICES EN FRANÇAIS

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** J'ai une pétition qui nous vient de francophones à la grandeur de la province :

« Attendu que la mission du commissaire aux services en français est de veiller à ce que la population reçoive en français des services de qualité du gouvernement de l'Ontario et de surveiller l'application de la Loi sur les services en français;

« Attendu que le commissaire a le mandat de mener des enquêtes indépendantes selon la Loi sur les services en français;

« Attendu que contrairement au vérificateur général, à l'ombudsman, au commissaire à l'environnement et au commissaire à l'intégrité qui, eux, relèvent de l'Assemblée législative, le commissaire aux services en français relève de la ministre déléguée aux services en français; »

Ils demandent « à l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario de changer les pouvoirs du commissaire aux services en français afin qu'il relève directement de l'Assemblée législative. »

Je suis en accord avec cette pétition, monsieur le Président, et je vais demander à la page Mackenzie de l'amener à la table des greffiers. Merci.

## KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I have the pleasure today of presenting a petition on behalf of Tony Lewis, who lives at 529 Riverside Drive in Peterborough, right on the Otonabee River. The Otonabee River meanders through the middle of the city of Peterborough—very nice homes on the Otonabee River. They're great.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, Canada, draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to the following:

"Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada;

"Whereas real progress has been made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease, in particular the development of a bioartificial kidney;

"We, the undersigned, call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make research funding available for the explicit purpose of conducting bioartificial kidney research as an extension to the research being successfully conducted at several centres in the United States."

I agree with this petition, Mr. Speaker, will affix my signature to it and give it to page William.

## CLIMATE CHANGE

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** This petition is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It's from Zero Carbon Ontario.

"Whereas global climate change is the most serious threat facing humanity and poses significant risks to our environment, economy, society and human health; and

"More than 97% of scientists working in the disciplines contributing to studies of our climate and all national science academies accept that climate change is almost certainly being caused by human activities mainly due to the use of fossil fuels; and

"The objective of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is 'stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system'; and

"Climate scientists are now warning us that limiting global temperature increase to 1.5 degrees centigrade is essential; and

"Ontario has a clear responsibility to reduce our emissions given that our per capita greenhouse gas emissions are among the highest in the world; and

"With the introduction of the Green Energy Act and feed-in tariff program, Ontario is an example to the rest of the world of the principle of renewable energy development; and

"The best research today indicates that energy demands are decreasing and that sufficient potential energy from a diverse supply of renewable sources exists to meet Ontario's current and projected energy demands;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Immediately prepare a plan that requires that 100% of Ontario's stationary energy be from zero-carbon sources before the end of 2023, with a timeline to be audited annually by the Auditor General and published reports."

This is from Zero Carbon Ontario. I support the petition and send it forward with David.

## WIND TURBINES

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas there is a growing body of evidence confirming industrial wind development has serious adverse effects on host communities;

"Whereas over 150 people in Ontario have reported serious negative health effects from industrial wind development, and at least a dozen families have been bought out of their homes;

1340

"Whereas Ontario's Green Energy Act has ended local planning control by stripping municipal councils of their rights;

"Whereas 80 municipal councils, representing two million Ontarians, called on the government to put in place a full moratorium on industrial wind development until an independent epidemiological health study is completed, proper environmental regulations and protections are put in place, and local democracy is restored;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Immediately put a moratorium on all industrial wind proposals; fund an independent epidemiological health

study to develop safe setbacks; legislate those findings; develop stringent environmental protection standards for natural areas; and require all projects to comply with regulations based on science and local planning.”

I gather from the rumblings on the other side, Mr. Speaker, that the government is not very comfortable with this petition. Therefore, I am delighted to sign it.

### KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I have a petition this afternoon from Dawn Ellis. She lives at 194 Braidwood Avenue in the south end of Peterborough. This street is about two blocks from where I grew up a few years ago.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, Canada, draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to the following:

“Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada;

“Whereas real progress has been made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease, in particular the development of a bioartificial kidney;

“We, the undersigned, call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make research funding available for the explicit purpose of conducting bioartificial kidney research as an extension to the research being successfully conducted at several centres in the United States” of America.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with this petition and will give it to page Grace and will affix my signature to it.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### FAMILY CAREGIVER LEAVE ACT (EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS AMENDMENT), 2012

#### LOI DE 2012 SUR LE CONGÉ FAMILIAL POUR LES AIDANTS NATURELS (MODIFICATION DES NORMES D'EMPLOI)

Resuming the debate adjourned on February 23, 2012, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 30, An Act to amend the Employment Standards Act, 2000 in respect of family caregiver leave / Projet de loi 30, Loi modifiant la Loi de 2000 sur les normes d'emploi en ce qui concerne le congé familial pour les aidants naturels.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** When we last debated second reading of Bill 30, the member for Chatham–Kent–Essex had the floor.

**Mr. Rick Nicholls:** I want to thank the Speaker and my colleagues for allowing me the time to continue my response to this very important issue in the Legislature, and the minister opposite for sharing the story of her own family's experiences with providing home care.

I'd also like to recognize the members opposite and their accommodation in allowing my colleague Jack MacLaren to share his wonderful maiden speech with us on Thursday past.

Mr. Speaker, that was an example of the kind of co-operation that I believe we need more of in this House. I'm not the only one who believes it. When I return to my riding in Chatham–Kent–Essex and speak with constituents in my office, at their places of business or on the street, I constantly hear the same refrain: “Get Ontario working again. Get us focused on what matters.”

For far too long, this government's focus has been elsewhere. While jobs have been lost, spending has run out of control and Ontario's debt has reached crisis proportions. I'm not given to using hyperbole, Mr. Speaker. When I say “crisis proportions,” the facts, while grim, bear me out. The Liberals' hand-picked adviser, Don Drummond, recently said that if action is not taken and taken immediately, Ontario will be staring a \$30-billion deficit in the very face in just a few years.

The Drummond report has demonstrated to all of us that the size, growth and scope of government have reached a tipping point in Ontario. Drummond reported in boxcar letters that efficiencies and productivity must be our singular priorities to wrestle with. These are sentiments that have been shared by this side of the House since well before the general election on October 6 that sent this government an important message: Get Ontario's fiscal house in order.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this government will be able to accomplish that on their own. In fact, Ontario citizens do not believe that this government has the ability to deal with the crisis they've created on their own.

Our caucus has been the strongest voice yet for finding efficiencies and reining in government spending. We recognized early all the warning signs of being in a hole and the need to stop digging.

How does one do that? You get yourself out of a hole by recognizing what got you there in the first place. You get yourself out of a hole by mapping an exit strategy carefully and while facing reality. You get yourself out by not spending your time on efforts not wholly dedicated to your final goal. These are sentiments that we would have been happy to share with the ministry well prior to the Drummond report, had they provided the opportunity to engage all sides in the preparation of this legislation.

Instead, at a time when Ontarians are looking to this government to own up to their mistakes and, for once, get ahead of the curve in solving this financial crisis in which they have placed Ontario, they find themselves stuck in their usual position, behind and struggling to catch up.

The Family Caregiver Leave Act does not complement or satisfy the clear priorities set out by the Drummond report of finding efficiencies and focusing on tackling the size and scope of government. In fact, this bill may yet add to our economic challenges by meddling with the operations of our homegrown businesses and

saddling Ontarians with unneeded legislation that this ministry does not know how to pay for.

In short, we do not want this caregiver act to morph and evolve into a care-payer act because of a lack of proper consultation on the part of this government.

Lingering questions remain, Mr. Speaker, and, as I mentioned last week, my briefings with this ministry revealed an alarming lack of consultation in the development of the proposed legislation. A thorough investigation of the facts is required, yet the minister was unable to provide even basic case histories, facts and figures on the economic cost of this legislation, and, perhaps most perplexing of all, the need for this legislation, when, by the minister's own admission, similar laws already exist to protect Ontario families.

There are currently mechanisms in place under law that allow employees job-protected leave in the event of a pressing family concern. The minister herself admitted that. They are called, quite appropriately, family medical leave and personal emergency leave. Yet here we are, discussing the passage of more legislation, another measure that will allow the government to creep another inch further into the lives of Ontario families. And for what? Certainly not, to my knowledge, because of overwhelming public demand. This ministry has no evidence of that—none.

The reason is simple, I believe: political posturing and nothing more.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be very clear: This is not and should not become a debate about the compassion of one party over another. Political gamesmanship serves few, yet injures many. Each of us was elected to serve the families that sent us here. I believe there is more at stake here than good intentions. It is my firm belief that this legislation, if passed in its current form, will leave employers open to serious questions that have no answer.

Where are the safeguards to prevent unscrupulous employees from abusing this legislation and requesting consecutive leaves from work? As I said last week, we don't know and the ministry can't tell us. Who pays for the legislation if the federal government refuses to cover it under employment insurance? We don't know and the ministry can't tell us. And what is the definition of "severe injury or illness"? We don't know and the ministry can't tell us. A doctor may be able to tell us, had this ministry performed the proper range of consultations required for such a delicate issue.

1350

What of the workers who must work two jobs just to get by in this difficult climate? Will this legislation provide them with two concurrent unpaid leaves? Will employment insurance be enough to make up for it?

Perhaps most importantly, Mr. Speaker, a question that occurs to me as someone who has owned and operated a business myself: How does the ministry foresee this legislation affecting the relationship between employer and employee? Will this government meddling interfere with that mutual understanding, mutual respect

and mutual accommodation? A real threat, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you.

These are the questions that would be self-evident in a responsible, sober piece of legislation. These are the questions that we would not need to address in the House today, had the minister come to us in a spirit of co-operation. Yet the ministry shrugged its shoulders when these questions were raised before the legislation was even introduced, and there are still no answers.

Ontario families already have too many unanswered questions, Mr. Speaker. They're tired of it. They're now calling for solutions, not for this government to find the answer to a question that nobody asked. It is for these reasons that I strongly urge, suggest and recommend that this minister withdraw the bill from second reading until the proper investigations and consultations have been completed. I propose that the government work with the opposition parties to create a select committee that will properly investigate and collect the necessary evidence to support the introduction of this bill, based upon merit and clear benefit for Ontario families and workers, not political posturing under the guise of good intentions.

Each of us here endeavours to address and find solutions to the myriad challenges that arise in the lives of Ontario families and workers. Yet we have a responsibility, never more crucial than right now, as Ontario faces a crisis, a fiscal crisis resulting from rash and irresponsible spending, to carefully examine any piece of legislation that proposes more spending and larger government based on insubstantial evidence. Mr. Speaker, a haphazard approach to legislation serves nobody.

Now is the time for this government to finally do their homework. It's time for this ministry to realize that needs come before wants and that political posturing does not have a seat at the table when it comes to getting Ontario back on track after years of mismanagement by this government. It behooves us as legislators, in the absence of evidence, to do the responsible thing and stand with precaution.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to be here in the House this afternoon. I look at this bill as a minor but essential positive step to provide a measure of job protection to those taking time off from work to care for their family members that are very seriously ill. However, I really feel it would be more effective if there was some sort of EI or income support for the worker who has to take that time off to look after their family members who are seriously ill.

Unfortunately, I don't think this is likely to happen, and the most vulnerable workers who might be faced with this decision are people who are working in low-paying jobs with no benefits. So it's really disadvantaging those workers and saying to them, "I'm sorry, but if you can't afford to take the time off and financially support yourself to look after a member of your family, you're out of luck."

The other issue that also comes to mind is enforcement of this benefit that they're proposing. It's always an issue through the Employment Standards Act that things will be monitored and enforced. The biggest obstacle that employees might face is the dilemma of: "Should I take time off? Will I feel reprisals from my employer if I should do that?" And if they don't take that time off, that opportunity—looking after a family member in a serious illness—that has come at a bad time in their life has gone by the time enforcement through the ESA has maybe come into play.

It really needs to have more review and more information so that people who are in a vulnerable state to look after the serious family members when they're ill are considered.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Joe Dickson:** It's my pleasure to rise, with glass of water in hand, as the parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for seniors and speak in reference to the family caregiver leave bill, Bill 30.

Family caregiver leave is a matter of compassion and the right thing to do for Ontario families. Our government believes that the last thing you should be worrying about when you're taking time off work to care for an ill family member is your job security. We will be encouraging the government to make this permanent legislation.

If passed, the bill would not—and I say "not"—come into force until July 1, 2012, giving employers the opportune time for transition.

I can tell you that on August 16, 2011, the government announced this proposal to create the family caregiver leave. The Premier has issued media releases on it: "Helping Caregivers Spend More Time with Sick Family Members." The Liberal Party platform document, "Forward. Together," also is committed to the creation of this new family caregiver leave legislation.

The Ministry of Labour is seeking approval to bring forward amendments to part of the Employment Standards Act, 2000, the ESA, to create family caregiver leave, a new unpaid, job-protected—the focus is on job-protected—leave of absence of up to eight weeks per calendar year for an employee whose family member has had a serious medical condition that requires care or support.

I can tell you that there is a gap in the current leaves of absence under the Employment Standards Act. This new legislation will rectify that and we should proceed forward on that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much. Questions and comments?

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** If you're watching at home and home happens to be Chatham–Kent–Essex, I'm congratulating your member and my new colleague for his first participation in significant debate on a bill under discussion for second reading here in the Ontario Legislative Assembly. I say that not only by way of congratulating my colleague, but also to bring attention to the fact that—I don't know what the number is, but it costs a small

fortune to run this palace. I bet you that for the number of days that we meet per year, we must be into \$1 million or \$2 million a day, somewhere in that vicinity. If that's the case, then we should be talking about significant and finished pieces of legislation.

There isn't anybody on this side of the House, there isn't anybody on any side of the House, who doesn't want to take care to provide compassion, to offer comfort and to be able to give whatever we can to someone who is under our care when they're sick and suffering. That's what this bill purports to be about. If this bill were taken in concert with other avenues or other approaches that we have in the province of Ontario, it might be something worth considering, but we have, at this point, two other programs already in place that tend to serve the same purpose. So why are we debating a third one that can be taken in concert with that?

The bottom line on this, as my colleague has pointed out, is that nobody has really come forward and asked for this. We don't sense any stakeholder interest in moving forward on this. There doesn't seem to be any groundswell that has resulted in this bill being brought forward by the Minister of Labour. So I am at a loss to explain why it is that we're even debating it.

I concur with my friend that a good avenue of approach might be to reconsider and withdraw this bill, flesh it out, look at it in concert with other programs and make the appropriate decision. Thank you, Speaker.

1400

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much. We have time for one last question or comment, and I look to the member for Nickel Belt.

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will add my two minutes on the Family Caregiver Leave Act.

Two parts of the act: The first is that it gives somebody eight weeks to look after somebody with a serious medical condition. The definition of "serious medical condition" makes it such that if you are really in the situation where a family member meets the serious medical conditions, chances are you are so stressed out that you couldn't do your work anyway.

I spent 25 years in health care before I came to this place. Not once in my 25 years of supervising a team of 84 people did I ever see an employer refuse leave, because if your child is in Sick Kids in pieces, you can't work, and your employer realizes this and gives you the leave. If he didn't give it to you, you could stand there all you want, and you wouldn't be able to concentrate or do anything because every cell in your body wants to be with that child that meets the "serious medical condition," and that goes for everybody else in our family.

What people really need is to be able to take care of that person. They need to not worry about where the money will come from to pay the rent, where the money will come from to pay all the expenses that are not covered by OHIP that they now have to assume for this seriously sick person. But none of that is in the bill.

There are a few people who will be helped by this bill, people in very precarious employment. But "precarious"

means you could lose your job at any time. If you don't lose it because your kid is at Sick Kids, you will lose it for another reason.

A very, very tiny bill, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** I'll return to the member for Chatham-Kent-Essex, who has two minutes to reply.

**Mr. Rick Nicholls:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments made by the members from London-Fanshawe, Nickel Belt, Ajax-Pickering and, of course, our esteemed member from Thornhill. Thank you for your kind remarks.

As mentioned earlier, I'm asking the Minister of Labour, who is seemingly addressing a compassion issue, of which we, as a caucus, are all extremely compassionate—the point is, I am strongly suggesting and recommending that the minister withdraw the bill from second reading until proper investigations and consultations have in fact been completed. Again, we're looking at creating a select committee that will properly investigate and collect the necessary evidence to support the introduction of this bill based upon merit and clear benefit for Ontario families and workers, not political posturing, as mentioned before, under the guise of good intentions. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for the time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Further debate?

*Applause.*

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to my colleagues for the warm welcome.

It is indeed a pleasure to rise to speak today to the Family Caregiver Leave Act. It's important to understand the reasoning for the act, and I think I do. It comes from some personal experience in terms of dealing with a loved one, a family member who was involved in a catastrophic injury. So I think I'll lead off with that angle of why I believe this bill has some merit and why I believe we will be supporting it.

I may already have told this story in the House, but I'll tell it again for the sake of context. In 2005, actually prior to that, my brother and I started a fitness club together, Summit Health and Fitness, in Nelson, British Columbia. If any of you have been to Nelson, BC, you know how wonderful it is. We started that in the late 1990s. It was a small community gym. It was well regarded; it still is today.

In 2005, my brother Eddie, who would spend 12 hours in the gym, working and training people and running the business, would leave into the beauty of the Kootenay mountains to search out his exercise. Who wants to be stuck in a gym all day to get your workout? So he'd go. He would leave and he'd find a trail on his mountain bike. That day, he went by himself on one of the trails, the hundreds of thousands of kilometres of trails that there are in beautiful BC, and eventually hit a rut in the trail, fell off his bike, and suffered a spinal cord injury. Luckily, about an hour and a half later, someone came down that trail who had a cellphone and triggered the

emergency response mechanism that we all know is required when someone faces an injury like that. They got him off of the hill, and they flew him to VGH, Vancouver General Hospital. He spent six months there. He went to GF Strong Rehabilitation in Vancouver.

It changed our lives forever as a family. What happened was that, just moments after, literally hours after the incident, my parents—my mom, who had worked for 35 years at General Motors, and my dad, who was recently retired from the Windsor board of education—set into motion their plans to go and take care of their son, as any of us would. That involved, of course, taking care of the home, making sure that all their affairs were taken care of, finding accommodations in Vancouver and travelling there, as well. Luckily, Mr. Speaker, both my parents worked in a unionized environment—long-time employment. They had very good jobs. They had benefits and they had a retirement package, so at that point, they could afford to make this transition. They could go, and they did, and they spent nearly a year there as my brother recovered from his injury.

To this day, Mr. Speaker, he is doing incredibly well. He continues to train athletes, train individuals in his community as a personal trainer—as one of the best, I would argue, in the province of BC. He serves as an inspiration, to me and to everybody that meets him, really. He's an amazing guy.

But it speaks to the requirement. Did we ever think that we would need to do this? Of course, no one ever does. No one plans for an injury like that. No one plans for an accident. No one plans to get hurt. But what we should know is that if that happens, there will be something there to safeguard us, something there to help us. Isn't that essentially what our health care system is all about? It's something that we knew as New Democrats, as CCFers, in Saskatchewan, something that Tommy Douglas invented and brought to this country, something that we keep in high regard, and I think something that Canadians as a whole cherish. It's those principles that, should you become ill or injured, no one should benefit from that, but you should also not lose from that incident. Why would it be that, just because you got sick, you might lose your job, lose your house, lose access to the safeguards you had prior to the injury or to the illness?

I think that that's what this bill attempts to do. It does, I believe, identify a gap in our Employment Standards Act. However, there are so many that continue to exist, in terms of actual enforcement of the act. That's a big question that I have, Mr. Speaker, as a member. We have so many provisions under the act that do provide some safeguards, but yet the enforcement mechanisms are so few and far between. In fact, many have called on the McGuinty government to ensure that the \$10-million commitment made by the government under the 2009 poverty reduction strategy be maintained. Right now, we feel as though, and signals have come to this effect, that may be under threat, that \$6 million of that \$10 million may be pulled from enforcement. It's important to note: How would we add another measure to the Employment

Standards Act, yet remove more provisions for enforcement? It doesn't necessarily make sense.

So why introduce this bill? I guess, Mr. Speaker, I've taken the approach, in terms of listening to various bills and motions and everything that happens in this House, of listening through the lens of whether it's just, whether it's fair and whether it's equal.

1410

So is this bill just? I think, in fact, it is. It does provide protection of employees who need to leave to give care to their loved ones, and it protects them up to eight weeks. What happens after that? What triggers after that? In the case of my brother, it was a year, and there were many, many other things that needed to come into play to allow my parents to provide that care.

Is it equal? If you take into consideration what exists at the federal level through the act that is similar in respect to delivering care to family members who are progressively getting worse and could potentially pass away, that act provides some measure of financial assistance through the employment insurance program.

I went for a walk, Mr. Speaker, just across the park. It's a lovely day here today at Queen's Park. There were some arborists who were trimming the trees in the park. I asked one of them, "I've got a question for you. If one of your family members were ill or injured, would you be able to take eight weeks off unpaid to go and care for them?" And he said, "No; there's no question. I could not do it. I could not afford to do it without potentially having to tap into my RRSPs or any savings that I have."

So it begs the question: What is the general health of workers in this province? Do they have the ability to actually take an amount of time unpaid for any reason at all? I don't think so. I don't have a statistic, but it has been bantered around for quite some time that Ontarians and Canadians in general are only two paycheques away from financial collapse, from losing everything they have. That's what we call precarious work, precarious employment, where your job does not provide you with the ability to save for those rainy days or these unfortunate accidents or chronic illnesses.

I think that's where this bill falls tremendously short, in not only providing the mechanism or even showing a way—the bill says that we've got to talk with our federal partners and potentially trigger some mechanism through employment insurance to provide assistance. But it neglects the fact that the health of workers and the impact and enforcement of the Employment Standards Act is really in peril. It's actually at a crisis, and this government has really neglected to respond to some of those really important aspects, aside from being told by many stakeholders that we are in a crisis situation.

We can pretty much identify who may be taking a look at this or who may access this. For the most part, it will be family members who need to take care of their parents, who are potentially in transition from their private home, looking for home care, looking for long-term care, but, as in many cases, and certainly in Windsor and Essex county, they're unable to find those spaces. So

indeed, a family member will come into the scenario and provide that care, take them into their home, ensure that they have access to assistive devices, make sure they retrofit their homes, even for the short stay. I know that it happens in my community and I'm sure it happens in other communities that members represent.

Another area where this bill misses the mark, I believe—and I think actually the agenda of the government has missed the mark. If we had a substantial inventory, Mr. Speaker, of long-term-care facilities and beds in Ontario, potentially we wouldn't need an eight-week buffer for the largest segment that I believe will be accessing the tools within this act. In fact, in Windsor and Essex county we have an ongoing saga called the Grace hospital site. For four years it has been under development or proposed to be a long-term-care facility. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that deal went sideways very quickly, and the Grace site remains an eyesore for the members that of community, it creates a backlog in our health care system and, really, members of the community are up in arms about the lack of attention and the lack of action that the provincial government has paid to those folks in Windsor.

I'm kind of glad that this bill has come about because it shines a light on the inadequacies of the Employment Standards Act, where roughly 700,000 people in Ontario are employed on a temporary basis—part-time, precarious work, minimum wage, no benefits, minimal hours, and without safety and security of income. It is a large portion of our economic downfall here, where the middle class, and that erosion of the middle class, has been made up and continues each and every year to be made up of this segment of workers, the precarious workers. They find, really, the only way they can enter into jobs these days is through temp agencies, which of course have blossomed under federal and provincial Liberal and Conservative governments; they have gone from roughly 1,000 in the country to now nearly 5,000 temp agencies that are really the staple of employers' labour sources. It seems as though they're relying on these types of workers more and more instead of the types of jobs that I told you my parents had, the types that allowed them to be able to provide for the care of one of their loved ones.

I think something has to be done with these agencies, Mr. Speaker. I think that—we are ill-served by them. They do not advocate on behalf of workers. They set out solely to take advantage of workers, to give access to cheap labour—almost like a renewable source of cheap labour where, before a 90-day period, they are terminated. That happens all too much in my riding under the manufacturing sector, where companies will take in a big pool of precarious workers through temp agencies, let them work for 89 days and then release them back out into the wild to fend for themselves. That cannot continue, certainly not if we expect to grow our economy in any measure coming through this economic crisis and meltdown—a financial meltdown is what it is, Mr. Speaker.

Also, through the Employment Standards Act, we see companies that already take advantage. I think this is the

concern that the government side is raising—that companies will take advantage of workers. You present your case for leave; you say, “My son, my daughter, my mother, my father, my family member is ill. I need to leave to provide them care.” Without this act, Mr. Speaker, it could be that that company, without any regard, fires that employee while they’re on their leave. It makes sense in that light.

But back to the enforcement of the act, we have companies to this day that—

*Interruption.*

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Are you okay? That’s all right. I trip up every time I walk into this place.

Mr. Speaker, I guess what I’m talking about is wage theft, and you know what? It happens in the millions of dollars each year.

I do have a figure. I believe over \$100 million each year is not paid out to employees. Either their hours of work are not adequately paid, or overtime hours. I wonder how long it would take if any one of the members in the House looked at their paycheck and saw that they were deducted a couple of hours off their cheque. It wouldn’t take too long for this House to be in uproar. Yet we don’t provide the mechanisms—certainly not enough of the mechanisms—for workers to find any compensation or to be able to actually recoup those dollars.

1420

What we do do, and what has happened, and what has changed under Bill C-68, I believe, was that we have now told workers that they are on their own when it comes to defending their rights under the Employment Standards Act, and that, in fact, if they intend on lodging a complaint to their employer, it’s incumbent upon them to first negotiate with the employer, to set their case, to present their case. Also, if they are requesting that the Ministry of Labour look into an incident of wage theft, they have to divulge a whole host of information, prior to the ministry actually triggering a response, really putting them in a vulnerable position and not advocating on their behalf at all but really leaving them out to sway in the wind.

I wonder if that’s the case today. If workers in this province are still frightened and still having their wages not paid out adequately and not feeling as though they have the proper safeguards within the ESA, then what gives us the comfort and the confidence that this act will be enforced to the letter of its law? I don’t know.

Those are questions that I look forward to having answered at the committee stage, questions that I believe are important to have answered for members of this Legislature and for those who will eventually seek to utilize this.

We are in a measure of economic insecurity and income insecurity. In my riding, Mr. Speaker, the issue is, and has been for nearly a decade, jobs and job creation, and not just the part-time, precarious work that I spoke about earlier but those good-paying jobs that we had and we were used to. We wonder where those went, and we wonder who was on watch as they left our province.

Those were jobs that provided for families, jobs that provided for communities, jobs that allowed people to donate their time—to donate their money, even. You only have to look at the donations to the United Way in communities like Windsor, where they’ve fallen by millions and millions of dollars. At one time, our community was known for giving the most per capita to the United Way, that offered so many valuable services, but now we are at an all-time low in terms of donations per capita.

So it is my hope that this allows a small measure of protection, and I know that it will, but the proper safeguards have to be there.

I just wonder about the intent. I heard some of the interjections from the opposition side, who say, “This is wrong-headed. We don’t need this. No one is talking about this.” I see the intent on the government side, which is saying, “We can do a little bit, but we can’t do everything.”

It’s funny that when it comes to what really makes common sense—when someone is ill, when one of your family members is ill, and needs help—New Democrats are saying, “Let’s help them. Let’s help them in a tangible way. Let’s provide them with financial assistance so they don’t lose their homes. Let’s ensure that they have the comfort and security to make sure that they can provide that care in a tangible way—actually be there and not be concerned about how they’re going to pay the bills.”

My colleague from Nickel Belt hit the nail on the head. Of course, there is no parent who would not do absolutely everything to provide the care for their loved ones, who ultimately could not work, would not be able to work, knowing that their loved one needed help. But there is the stress that that puts on someone, the added stress of knowing, “I have to do this. I may have protection under the family caregiver act, but it’s going to hurt, and I may lose more than I can give.”

So I urge the government to really come to the table and add the substantive pieces to this, add the components that you know will make this bill work effectively, find the measures to ensure that people feel financially secure that they can take up to eight weeks and know that they won’t be put into a precarious position in terms of their income.

I know that members have an important delegation to attend, and I look forward to it, as well. I won’t take up the entirety of my time.

I hope my story—and I know members of this House have similar stories, and if you don’t, I hope you never have to have those stories. I hope they will deeply consider the shortfalls that currently exist under the ESA, the shortfalls that have been pointed out for years and years, the nature of workers in this province, the fact that income growth is stagnant and has been even prior to the recession, the fact that no one should profit due to someone else’s illness and, also, no one should lose from a family member’s illness, and take those into consideration—is it just, is it fair, is it equal—and add the

components to this bill to make sure that it actually is a functional bill, that you get a good catchment from it, that people recognize, “Wow, something happened in the Ontario Legislature that, should I need it, is actually going to help.”

I think that's the job we are tasked to do in this House. It's the job I know that I'm prepared to do. If there is a will, there is a way. We all know that, and it will come down to political will. I think you can rest assured that New Democrats will support the intent but can offer some progressive suggestions on how this bill could be made a lot better—and it can be. It could be made very strong, something that other provinces could actually hold in high regard and could hold as an example that potentially they may want to do in other provinces. I would look forward to that, and I think that members have the opportunity to really make a difference here.

I think I've covered just a brief amount in my time. I know there's a lot more work to do, but I will look forward to doing that at the committee stage, and I look forward to interjection from my colleagues in the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** It's a pleasure to join the debate and to pass comments on the comments that were just given. I took them, for the most part, to be very supportive comments, and I thank the member for that. I think this is an issue that all of us can agree that there are times in each of the lives of our constituents when they need the intervention of government or they need the powers that are granted to government to be exercised in a way that does something for them.

When somebody in their family is seriously ill or when somebody gets injured—it's a quick, sudden thing, and those individuals need that time to be with their loved ones, need to know that they have to go and care for those people. They don't want to be thinking “Perhaps I'm going to lose my job” or “Somehow my job is in jeopardy if I do the thing” that each and every one of us would put as our first priority, and that is, to go and care for people within our family who need us because of illness or because of injury.

It's the right thing to do, simply, and I hope that it does receive the support of all parties as it moves forward. Obviously, it has to go through the committee process, and any improvements, adjustments or amendments can be considered at that time.

What it does, essentially, is that it says to the people of the province of Ontario, when something happens—and we hope it doesn't happen to everybody, but we know the human condition will dictate that from time to time people do get ill and get injured. It's not unusual for a family member to be a first responder in that regard or to be the person that the ill person looks to for their care on a daily basis. What this allows us to do, as individuals, is to move forward, give that care, and also to know that we're protected by our government, that we aren't going to lose our jobs as a result of that.

1430

I think the concept behind this is one that we can all get behind. I'd ask all members of the House to give their support. Thank you, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much. Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** Thank you to the member from Essex for his comments.

Just a few comments on this proposed bill, coming from my research: I haven't quite heard a huge public outcry of support for this bill. It's more “You might need it, so let's come up with this bill to replace it.” In fact, this is the sixth new leave-of-absence bill in the last seven years that's been proposed.

A few problems I have with this bill: The first one is that “serious medical condition” hasn't been defined. What exactly does that mean? Is asthma a serious medical condition? Is back pain, arthritis? Let's get these definitions down pat before we release it out into the community.

The other part that I have problems with is that there's no employee threshold. You're talking about the big businesses out there, but I'm talking about the small family-owned and independent businesses out there, those with five employees or two employees. What are the thresholds out there? The personal emergency leave has a threshold of 50 employees, which is good. Smaller businesses don't have the cross-training or the resources necessary to replace these employees who leave. We also have the family medical emergency leave that the person could technically use in the short term, if need be.

The other point I want to make, basically, to the medical leave, is that the federal government is supportive of that. If someone leaves, they'll get up to six weeks of employment insurance coverage to cover their costs while they are looking after their loved one. All we have from this government is an intention to ask the federal government to please include this in their employment insurance coverage.

I think that's putting the horse before the cart. If you're going to really want to push out there and put a new leave of absence, let's get everything in place. The main thing is to get the federal government on side, get the small businesses on side, and let's define what's actually needed in this bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** I wanted to first thank the member from Essex and the member from Nickel Belt for raising the issue of precarious work; it used to be that precarious work was contract work, perhaps farm work, some retail work, but today, precarious work can mean anything.

Raising the issue of all of us being maybe two weeks away from bankruptcy or financial disaster—it used to be that the public sector, people like nurses, teachers, firefighters and police officers, had a job pretty much for the rest of their lives. They started in that profession and that's where they ended. But now, those jobs are even

precarious and at risk. We have Rob Ford here in the city of Toronto threatening to reduce the number of police officers in the city, so those jobs are at risk. Every week, a hospital in this province is announcing the layoff of registered nurses to reduce their budgets. So their jobs are precarious and at risk. Now we have Mr. Don Drummond making his announcements about education, about laying off anybody who isn't directly involved in education and increasing class sizes, which will lay off teachers. So every job is now precarious.

The current legislation under the ESA for overtime, for vacation and for pregnancy leave isn't properly enforced currently. It's not done in a timely or effective way. So I think that there need to be safeguards in this legislation to ensure that it can be enforced.

I have one question about whether or not the weeks will be able to be used as days, as opposed to weeks, which would allow family members to share support, and it wouldn't impact their income as negatively. Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mrs. Laura Albanese:** There are many things that the members in this House may debate and have varied opinions on, but I think that the need for compassion for our loved ones when they are facing a medical crisis is not one of them, and I can hear that from the members' comments this afternoon so far. That's because I think that everyone in this House, and those who may be watching these proceedings on the television, knows that when a loved one faces a serious illness or an injury, we need to be at their side and we want to be at their side. It's very important. That's when we find out how important—we are dependent on them—and they find out how important it is for them to count on us.

So this is what this legislation is meant to do: to ease those hard times. Everyone, I think, will have a personal story. I very much appreciated the one that the member for Essex has shared with us. I too had personal experience when my dad fell ill in Italy. I had to struggle. I had to go back numerous times. Every time we would get a phone call and hear that he may not make it over a few days, we travelled. Fortunately, he would get better. You would be there assisting for the care, trying to put it in place, always in very short time constraints. Fortunately, he would get better. We'd come back. A few months later, the phone call would come again. It was very hard to juggle that with family and with the employer, who was very understanding in my case, but it's not always so.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Now we return to the member for Essex, who has two minutes to reply to questions and comments.

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** I want to thank the members from Oakville, Elgin-Middlesex-London, Welland and York South-Weston for their comments.

I'll just leave us with this, Mr. Speaker: I spoke a little bit about precarious work and the nature of workers in Ontario today. The Workers' Action Centre published a report—Unpaid Wages, Unprotected Workers—exposing the reality of work where wages, overtime and vacation pay goes unpaid and people work at less than minimum wage. They surveyed 520 people in low-wage and precarious work.

Twenty-two per cent earned less than minimum wage. An additional 22% worked at minimum wage—that is, 10% below the poverty line—in 2011. Thirty-nine per cent of those that worked overtime failed to receive overtime pay; 36% of workers were fired or laid off without termination pay or notice; 34% had problems getting their vacation pay; and 33% of workers reported being owed wages from their employer. And 77% of these workers were unsuccessful in obtaining the wages owed to them.

It highlights the inadequacies of enforcement within our Employment Standards Act, Mr. Speaker. The threat, again, as mentioned in my earlier statement, is that the \$6 million that is proposed to be pulled from the anti-poverty strategy will affect the further enforcement of the Employment Standards Act, to the detriment of these types of workers: the ones that need the help the most.

If the intent of this bill is to help those who need it the most, then let's start by absolutely stopping the threat of pulling that funding, of pulling that envelope, because we know that it will only make things worse. There are ways that we can help. That's one of them, and finding some financial assistance for folks under this act will help as well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Further debate? I recognize the member for York South-Weston.

**Mrs. Laura Albanese:** I move adjournment of the debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** The member for York South-Weston has moved the adjournment of the debate. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed to the motion will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

*Second reading debate adjourned.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Orders of the day?

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** Speaker, I'm very pleased to move adjournment of the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** The Attorney General has moved the adjournment of the House. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 9 a.m.

*The House adjourned at 1440.*

**ERRATUM**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Column</b>	<b>Line(s)</b>	<b>Should read:</b>
L14	562	2	48-49	<b>Ms. Cindy Forster:</b> But they want to do public sector wage freezes.

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: Hon. / L'hon. David C. Onley, O.Ont.

Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Dave Levac

Clerk / Greffière: Deborah Deller

Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman, Tonia Grannum

Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Albanese, Laura (LIB)	York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston	
Armstrong, Teresa J. (NDP)	London–Fanshawe	
<b>Arnott, Ted (PC)</b>	Wellington–Halton Hills	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée
Bailey, Robert (PC)	Sarnia–Lambton	
<b>Balkissoon, Bas (LIB)</b>	Scarborough–Rouge River	Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée Deputy Speaker / Vice-président
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand–Norfolk	
<b>Bartolucci, Hon. / L'hon. Rick (LIB)</b>	Sudbury	Chair of Cabinet / Président du Conseil des ministres Minister of Northern Development and Mines / Ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie
<b>Bentley, Hon. / L'hon. Christopher (LIB)</b>	London West / London-Ouest	
Berardinetti, Lorenzo (LIB)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	
<b>Best, Hon. / L'hon. Margaret R. (LIB)</b>	Scarborough–Guildwood	Minister of Consumer Services / Ministre des Services aux consommateurs
Bisson, Gilles (NDP)	Timmins–James Bay / Timmins–Baie James	House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire de parti reconnu
<b>Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (LIB)</b>	St. Catharines	Minister of the Environment / Ministre de l'Environnement Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
<b>Broten, Hon. / L'hon. Laurel C. (LIB)</b>	Etobicoke–Lakeshore	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation Minister Responsible for Women's Issues / Ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Campbell, Sarah (NDP)	Kenora–Rainy River	
Cansfield, Donna H. (LIB)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	
<b>Chan, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Markham–Unionville	Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport / Ministre de Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport
<b>Chiarelli, Hon. / L'hon. Bob (LIB)</b>	Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Minister of Infrastructure / Ministre de l'Infrastructure Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Halton	
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds–Grenville	
Colle, Mike (LIB)	Eglinton–Lawrence	
Coteau, Michael (LIB)	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	
Crack, Grant (LIB)	Glengarry–Prescott–Russell	
Craitor, Kim (LIB)	Niagara Falls	
Damerla, Dipika (LIB)	Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville	
Delaney, Bob (LIB)	Mississauga–Streetsville	
Dhillon, Vic (LIB)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Dickson, Joe (LIB)	Ajax–Pickering	
DiNovo, Cheri (NDP)	Parkdale–High Park	
<b>Duguid, Hon. / L'hon. Brad (LIB)</b>	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Minister of Economic Development and Innovation / Ministre du Développement économique et de l'Innovation
<b>Duncan, Hon. / L'hon. Dwight (LIB)</b>	Windsor–Tecumseh	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / Président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement Deputy Premier / Vice-premier ministre Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances
Dunlop, Garfield (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	
Elliott, Christine (PC)	Whitby–Oshawa	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Fedeli, Victor (PC)	Nipissing	Deputy House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire adjointe de parti reconnu
Flynn, Kevin Daniel (LIB)	Oakville	
Forster, Cindy (NDP)	Welland	
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	Attorney General / Procureur général
<b>Gerretsen, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les îles	
<b>Gravelle, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Thunder Bay–Superior North / Thunder Bay–Superior-Nord	
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	Minister of Natural Resources / Ministre des Richesses naturelles
Harris, Michael (PC)	Kitchener–Conestoga	
Hillier, Randy (PC)	Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington	
Horwath, Andrea (NDP)	Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre	Leader, Recognized Party / Chef de parti reconnu
<b>Hoskins, Hon. / L'hon. Eric (LIB)</b>	St. Paul's	Leader, New Democratic Party of Ontario / Chef du Nouveau parti démocratique de l'Ontario
Hudak, Tim (PC)	Niagara West–Glanbrook / Niagara-Ouest–Glanbrook	Minister of Children and Youth Services / Ministre des Services à l'enfance et à la jeunesse
Jackson, Rod (PC)	Barrie	Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle
Jaczek, Helena (LIB)	Oak Ridges–Markham	Leader, Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur de l'Ontario
<b>Jeffrey, Hon. / L'hon. Linda (LIB)</b>	Brampton–Springdale	Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail
Jones, Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin–Caledon	Minister Responsible for Seniors / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires des personnes âgées
Klees, Frank (PC)	Newmarket–Aurora	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Kwinter, Monte (LIB)	York Centre / York-Centre	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
Leal, Jeff (LIB)	Peterborough	
Leone, Rob (PC)	Cambridge	
<b>Levac, Hon. / L'hon. Dave (LIB)</b>	Brant	Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / Ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
MacCharles, Tracy (LIB)	Pickering–Scarborough East / Pickering–Scarborough-Est	
MacLaren, Jack (PC)	Carleton–Mississippi Mills	
MacLeod, Lisa (PC)	Nepean–Carleton	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales
Mangat, Amrit (LIB)	Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud	
Mantha, Michael (NDP)	Algoma–Manitoulin	
Marchese, Rosario (NDP)	Trinity–Spadina	Premier / Premier ministre
<b>Matthews, Hon. / L'hon. Deborah (LIB)</b>	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	
Mauro, Bill (LIB)	Thunder Bay–Atikokan	
McDonell, Jim (PC)	Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry	Leader, Government / Chef du gouvernement
<b>McGuinty, Hon. / L'hon. Dalton (LIB)</b>	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	Leader, Liberal Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti libéral de l'Ontario
McKenna, Jane (PC)	Burlington	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
<b>McMeekin, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (LIB)</b>	Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough–Westdale	
McNaughton, Monte (PC)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	
McNeely, Phil (LIB)	Ottawa–Orléans	Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / Ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels
<b>Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (LIB)</b>	Ottawa–Vanier	
Miller, Norm (PC)	Parry Sound–Muskoka	
<b>Miller, Paul (NDP)</b>	Hamilton East–Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est–Stoney Creek	Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones
		Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Milligan, Rob E. (PC)	Northumberland—Quinte West	Minister of Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement
<b>Milloy, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	
Moridi, Reza (LIB)	Richmond Hill	
<b>Munro, Julia (PC)</b>	York—Simcoe	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Murray, Hon. / L'hon. Glen R. (LIB)</b>	Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Naqvi, Yasir (LIB)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration / Ministre des Affaires civiques et de l'Immigration
Natyshak, Taras (NDP)	Essex	
Nicholls, Rick (PC)	Chatham—Kent—Essex	
O'Toole, John (PC)	Durham	
Oraziotti, David (LIB)	Sault Ste. Marie	
Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Oshawa	
Pettapiece, Randy (PC)	Perth—Wellington	
Piruzza, Teresa (LIB)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	
Prue, Michael (NDP)	Beaches—East York	
Qaadri, Shafiq (LIB)	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	
Sandals, Liz (LIB)	Guelph	
Schein, Jonah (NDP)	Davenport	
Scott, Laurie (PC)	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	
Sergio, Mario (LIB)	York West / York-Ouest	
Shurman, Peter (PC)	Thornhill	
Singh, Jagmeet (NDP)	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	
Smith, Todd (PC)	Prince Edward—Hastings	
Sorbara, Greg (LIB)	Vaughan	
<b>Sousa, Hon. / L'hon. Charles (LIB)</b>	Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud	
Tabuns, Peter (NDP)	Toronto—Danforth	Minister of Government Services / Ministre des Services gouvernementaux
<b>Takhar, Hon. / L'hon. Harinder S. (LIB)</b>	Mississauga—Erindale	
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle
Thompson, Lisa M. (PC)	Huron—Bruce	
Vanthof, John (NDP)	Timiskaming—Cochrane	
Walker, Bill (PC)	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	
Wilson, Jim (PC)	Simcoe—Grey	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Witmer, Elizabeth (PC)	Kitchener—Waterloo	
Wong, Soo (LIB)	Scarborough—Agincourt	
<b>Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (LIB)</b>	Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	
Yakabuski, John (PC)	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	
Yurek, Jeff (PC)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	
Zimmer, David (LIB)	Willowdale	

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Standing Committee on Estimates / Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Grant Crack, Kim Craitor  
Vic Dhillon, Michael Harris  
Rob Leone, Taras Natyshak  
Rick Nicholls, Michael Prue  
Mario Sergio  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs /  
Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Bob Delaney, Victor Fedeli  
Cindy Forster, Monte McNaughton  
Yasir Naqvi, Teresa Piruzza  
Michael Prue, Peter Shurman  
Soo Wong  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on General Government / Comité  
permanent des affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Sarah Campbell, Michael Coteau  
Joe Dickson, Rosario Marchese  
David Oraziotti, Laurie Scott  
Todd Smith, Jeff Yurek  
David Zimmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przedziecki

**Standing Committee on Government Agencies / Comité  
permanent des organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Donna H. Cansfield, Helena Jaczek  
Bill Mauro, Jim McDonell  
Phil McNeely, Randy Pettapiece  
Peter Tabuns, Monique Taylor  
Lisa M. Thompson  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Justice Policy / Comité permanent de  
la justice**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Laura Albanese, Teresa J. Armstrong  
Lorenzo Berardinetti, Mike Colle  
Frank Klees, Jack MacLaren  
Paul Miller, Rob E. Milligan  
Shafiq Qaadri  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly / Comité  
permanent de l'Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Laura Albanese, Bas Balkissoon  
Gilles Bisson, Donna H. Cansfield  
Steve Clark, Garfield Dunlop  
Jeff Leal, Lisa MacLeod  
Jonah Schein  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts / Comité permanent  
des comptes publics**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Toby Barrett, France Gélinas  
Phil McNeely, Norm Miller  
Reza Moridi, Jerry J. Ouellette  
Liz Sandals, Jagmeet Singh  
David Zimmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills / Comité  
permanent des règlements et des projets de loi d'intérêt privé**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Michael Coteau, Grant Crack  
Vic Dhillon, Randy Hillier  
Rod Jackson, Mario Sergio  
Peter Tabuns, John Vanthof  
Bill Walker  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Tamara Pomanski

**Standing Committee on Social Policy / Comité permanent de  
la politique sociale**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Ted Chudleigh, Dipika Damerla  
Cheri DiNovo, Kevin Daniel Flynn  
Ernie Hardeman, Tracy MacCharles  
Amrit Mangat, Michael Mantha  
Jane McKenna  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch



*Continued from back cover*

<b>Fair Share for Peel</b>	
Mrs. Amrit Mangat .....	669
<b>School transportation</b>	
Mr. Todd Smith .....	669
<b>Healthy homes renovation tax credit</b>	
Mr. Bob Delaney .....	669
<b>Child safety</b>	
Mrs. Jane McKenna .....	669

## MOTIONS

<b>Committee sittings</b>	
Hon. John Milloy .....	670
Motion agreed to .....	670

## PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS

<b>Aggregate extraction</b>	
Mr. Jim Wilson .....	670
<b>School closure</b>	
Mr. Taras Natyshak .....	670
<b>Kidney disease</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal .....	670
<b>Health care funding</b>	
Mr. Jim Wilson .....	671
<b>Diagnostic services</b>	
Mme France Gélinas .....	671
<b>Education funding</b>	
Mr. Phil McNeely .....	671
<b>Rural schools</b>	
Mr. Jim Wilson .....	671

<b>Services en français</b>	
Mme France Gélinas .....	672
<b>Kidney disease</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal .....	672
<b>Climate change</b>	
Mr. Phil McNeely .....	672
<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. Jim Wilson .....	672
<b>Kidney disease</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal .....	673

## ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

<b>Family Caregiver Leave Act (Employment Standards Amendment), 2012, Bill 30, Mrs. Jeffrey / Loi de 2012 sur le congé familial pour les aidants naturels (modification des normes d'emploi), projet de loi 30, Mme Jeffrey</b>	
Mr. Rick Nicholls .....	673
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong .....	674
Mr. Joe Dickson .....	675
Mr. Peter Shurman .....	675
Mme France Gélinas .....	675
Mr. Rick Nicholls .....	676
Mr. Taras Natyshak .....	676
Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn .....	679
Mr. Jeff Yurek .....	679
Ms. Cindy Forster .....	679
Mrs. Laura Albanese .....	680
Mr. Taras Natyshak .....	680
Second reading debate adjourned .....	680
<b>Erratum</b> .....	681

## CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Monday 27 February 2012 / Lundi 27 février 2012

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Mr. Monte McNaughton .....	655
Mr. Michael Mantha .....	655
Hon. Margaret R. Best .....	655
Mr. Garfield Dunlop .....	655
Mr. Jonah Schein.....	655
Ms. Lisa MacLeod .....	655
Miss Monique Taylor.....	655
Mr. Rod Jackson .....	655
Mr. Michael Prue .....	655

### ORAL QUESTIONS / QUESTIONS ORALES

#### Taxation

Mr. Tim Hudak .....	655
Hon. Dalton McGuinty.....	655

#### Taxation

Mr. Tim Hudak .....	656
Hon. Dalton McGuinty.....	657

#### Air ambulance service

Ms. Andrea Horwath.....	657
Hon. Dalton McGuinty.....	658
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	658

#### Air ambulance service

Ms. Andrea Horwath.....	658
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	658

#### Air ambulance service

Mr. Frank Klees .....	659
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	659

#### Air ambulance service

Mr. Taras Natyshak.....	659
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	659

#### Supply management

Mr. Jeff Leal.....	660
Hon. Ted McMeekin .....	660

#### Air ambulance service

Mr. Frank Klees .....	660
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	661

#### Nuclear power facilities

Mr. Peter Tabuns.....	661
Hon. Christopher Bentley.....	661

#### Energy policies

Mr. Phil McNeely .....	661
Hon. Christopher Bentley.....	662

#### Air ambulance service

Mr. Peter Shurman .....	662
Hon. Dalton McGuinty.....	662

#### Waste reduction

Mr. Jonah Schein.....	663
Hon. James J. Bradley .....	663

#### Accessibility for the disabled

Mr. Michael Coteau.....	663
Hon. John Milloy .....	663

#### Home warranty program

Mr. Ted Chudleigh .....	664
Hon. Margaret R. Best .....	664

#### Manufacturing jobs

Ms. Cindy Forster.....	664
Hon. Ted McMeekin .....	664

#### Family caregiver leave

Ms. Soo Wong.....	665
Hon. Linda Jeffrey .....	665

#### Correction of record

Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	665
-----------------------------	-----

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Ms. Tracy MacCharles .....	665
Mr. Rosario Marchese .....	665

#### Rail accident

Hon. John Milloy .....	666
Mrs. Jane McKenna.....	666
Mr. Gilles Bisson .....	667
The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac) .....	667

### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS / DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

#### School transportation

Mr. Jeff Yurek.....	667
---------------------	-----

#### Riding of Davenport

Mr. Jonah Schein.....	668
-----------------------	-----

#### Action Ontario

Ms. Helena Jaczek.....	668
------------------------	-----

#### School transportation

Mr. Randy Pettapiece .....	668
----------------------------	-----

#### Butch Windsor

Mr. Michael Prue .....	668
------------------------	-----

*Continued on inside back cover*



No. 17

N° 17

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 40<sup>th</sup> Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 40<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Tuesday 28 February 2012

Mardi 28 février 2012



Speaker  
Honourable Dave Levac

Président  
L'honorable Dave Levac

Clerk  
Deborah Deller

Greffière  
Deborah Deller

### **Hansard on the Internet**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

### **Le Journal des débats sur Internet**

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

### **Renseignements sur l'index**

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.



## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 28 February 2012

## ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 28 février 2012

*The House met at 0900.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Please join me in prayer.

*Prayers.*

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### SECURITY FOR COURTS, ELECTRICITY GENERATING FACILITIES AND NUCLEAR FACILITIES ACT, 2012 LOI DE 2012 SUR LA SÉCURITÉ DES TRIBUNAUX, DES CENTRALES ÉLECTRIQUES ET DES INSTALLATIONS NUCLÉAIRES

Mrs. Meilleur moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 34, An Act to repeal the Public Works Protection Act, amend the Police Services Act with respect to court security and enact the Security for Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012 / Projet de loi 34, Loi abrogeant la Loi sur la protection des ouvrages publics, modifiant la Loi sur les services policiers en ce qui concerne la sécurité des tribunaux et édictant la Loi de 2012 sur la sécurité des centrales électriques et des installations nucléaires.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Debate?

**Hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member from Scarborough—Agincourt.

I rise today to talk about ensuring we strike the right balance between security and civil rights when it comes to protecting Ontario's courthouses, electricity generating plants and nuclear facilities.

Today, I will speak to the Security for Courts, Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012. If passed, the new legislation will repeal and replace the Public Works Protection Act. Simply put, the time has come to modernize the legal framework under which we protect our courthouses and critical infrastructure such as nuclear and electricity generating facilities. The Public Works Protection Act was passed at the outset of the Second World War.

Cette loi a été adoptée au début de la Deuxième Guerre mondiale en réponse à la crainte que les centrales électriques de la province, ses barrages, ses ponts et autres infrastructures publiques essentielles soient la cible de saboteurs.

Mr. Speaker, while those fears might have been legitimate more than 70 years ago, the Ontario of today faces new realities. We live in an open and democratic society where balancing civil liberties with protecting critical infrastructure installations is an important debate. We welcome the ongoing discussion, but we are not shying away from our mandate to ensure that Ontario's nuclear and electricity generating facilities are adequately protected, as well as the safety of Ontarians who live near them. And we are not shying away from our obligation to ensure our courts and those who work in our justice system are adequately protected.

Cette loi est cependant invoquée dans des circonstances limitées. Elle est appliquée chaque jour pour assurer la sécurité des tribunaux, des installations nucléaires et de certaines centrales d'énergie.

Although the current PWPA is relied on only in limited circumstances, it is used on a daily basis to provide security at electricity generating and court facilities.

The powers included in the PWPA were requested by the Toronto Police Service just ahead of the G20 summit in June 2010. There were uncertainties and vagueness associated with the PWPA that were brought to the fore as a result of its use in relation to the G20.

In 2010, the Ombudsman produced a report which raised important questions about how the PWPA works and how it was used at the time of the G20. In the wake of this, our government asked former Chief Justice Roy McMurtry to review the scope and appropriateness of the PWPA and to provide recommendations.

The report recommended that the PWPA be repealed after Ontario has considered potential policy and security gaps as a result of its repeal. In response to Mr. McMurtry's report, the government committed to begin consultations on replacement legislation that would repeal the PWPA. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, there was a need for us to act, and as a result, we introduced the Security for Courts, Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act.

In his review of the PWPA, former Chief Justice Roy McMurtry found the definition of "public work" to be too broad.

One of the things we needed to define more clearly, following the report, was what should be included in the proposed legislation. The replacement legislation is more focused and builds on current uses of the PWPA for security at courthouses, nuclear facilities and large electricity generating facilities.

The Ombudsman's report also helped guide how we would replace the PWPA. In his report, the Ombudsman

made it clear that the regulation adopted at the request of the Toronto Police Service was not appropriate for a modern society.

In particular, the Ombudsman questioned why Ontarians were not informed of this regulation and the PWPA, which gave police officers powers that are not commonly used in our province, outside courthouses and nuclear facilities.

Mr. Speaker, we have listened to both McMurtry and Marin. Our proposed legislation and associated regulations will identify the narrow categories of infrastructure that are protected under it. Any changes to the act would be subject to legislative debate. This is because an amendment would be needed to add other types of facilities that could be protected under our proposed legislation. We have made the process more open, transparent and clear.

#### 0910

Much has changed in Ontario since the Second World War and the introduction of the PWPA. The outdated PWPA is no longer necessary in its current form, although some of the powers it grants are still used daily, as I have mentioned earlier.

Mr. Speaker, it's important to note, as did Mr. McMurtry, that other laws exist to help keep our critical infrastructure secure. There is the Criminal Code that gives police the powers to deal with breaches of peace and riots. Common law, too, gives the police important powers to preserve the peace and protect life and property. The Ontario Trespass to Property Act is also a potential source of police power to arrest without warrant those who are unlawfully on certain premises or who were recently unlawfully on the premises. In addition, our Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act allows an emergency order to be put in place to restrict travel and movement to and from specific areas in the event of a declared provincial emergency. Finally, regulations under the Police Services Act mandate police services to put in place procedures consistent with plans to deal with acts of terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, you can see that more specific and more modern pieces of legislation have made the current PWPA outdated and unneeded.

As we began the work to repeal and replace the PWPA, a constant principle guiding our efforts was to listen to our partners. To that end, we met and listened to Ontarians and groups who helped inform our approach. In the last few months, we have consulted widely with municipalities, civil liberties advocates, representatives from the nuclear sector, electricity producers, court security, critical infrastructure and police.

I'm happy to say that with this groundwork, we have achieved a broad consensus now about how to proceed. We and our partners believe that the proposed replacement legislation achieves a balance: providing powers to protect certain facilities, but doing so in a way that minimally infringes on our civil liberties.

What we heard was clear: Transparency, openness and continued security of our critical infrastructure are not competing but are complementary objectives.

From the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, we heard that any new powers should be tailored to address unique security threats that arise within the nuclear security context and that these powers be clearly articulated and communicated to the public. I believe that this legislation addresses the concerns of the Canadian Civil Liberties Association.

Madam Speaker, again, this proposed legislation sets out the powers to be used at courthouses and the amendment to the Police Services Act that will make this possible.

From the energy sector, we heard that the operators of nuclear installations and electricity generating facilities require additional powers for the purpose of protecting nuclear and electricity generating facilities. I'll provide more details on the powers given by the proposed legislation in a few minutes, but let me say that we agree with our partners from the energy sector on that issue.

We have also certainly listened to former Chief Justice McMurtry. With this proposed legislation, we are meeting our commitment to repeal the PWPA and implement key recommendations of the McMurtry report.

La loi proposée cible les trois objectifs suivants :

- abroger la Loi sur la protection des ouvrages publics;

- proposer des modifications à la Loi sur les services policiers concernant la sécurité des tribunaux;

- établir une loi indépendante concernant la sécurité dans les installations électriques et nucléaires prescrites.

Madam Speaker, the Security for Courts, Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, if passed, will not only lead to the repeal of the PWPA, but it will give us a new law that deftly balances civil liberties with the protection of nuclear and electricity generating infrastructure. Let me give you some examples.

As it relates to court security, the legislation will address court security through an amendment to the Police Services Act. We have generally replicated, with some updates and clarifications, the powers available under the PWPA.

The legislation will provide security staff with the powers to, where reasonable:

- require any person entering or inside a courthouse to produce identification and provide information to assess their security risk, if any;

- search, without a warrant, any person, property or vehicle entering or attempting to enter premises where court proceedings are conducted;

- search, without a warrant, and using reasonable force if necessary, any person who is in custody where court proceedings are conducted or who is being transported to or from such premises or any property in the custody/care of that person.

Madam Speaker, I would like to emphasize that while the legislation may require a person entering or attempt-

ing to enter a courthouse to submit to a search, produce identification or provide information, if anyone does not want to comply, they can simply walk away. However, if they persist in entering the courthouse after refusing to provide information or submit to a search, court security personnel can: refuse entry and/or demand that the person leave the premises; and use reasonable force, if necessary, to exclude or remove the person. If a person continues to try to enter and/or refuses to leave the court, they could be arrested.

Madam Speaker, these powers are justifiable measures to ensure the security of our courthouses and to help maintain the efficiency of our judicial system.

In our proposed legislation, we've narrowed the focus to electricity generating and nuclear facilities. Unlike the PWPA, this act covers very limited categories of infrastructure. The legislation will apply to prescribed electricity generating facilities and prescribed nuclear facilities.

The act permits the appointment of security personnel at these facilities who will be peace officers with the power to request any person who wishes to enter or is on the premises to produce identification and provide information for the purposes of assessing the person's security risk; and search, upon consent, any person, property or vehicle entering or on the premises. Similar to the court security legislation, a person can simply walk away if they do not wish to submit to a search, produce identification or provide information.

0920

If they persist in entering the facility after refusing to provide information or submit to a search, security personnel can refuse entry and/or demand that the person immediately leave, and use reasonable force, if necessary, to prevent their entry or remove them. Any person who continues to try to enter and/or refuses to leave the premises could be arrested.

We're also going to establish the same offences and penalties as for court security violations: 60 days in jail or a \$2,000 fine.

The act also provides the authority to make regulations to prescribe electricity generating facilities and nuclear facilities; govern the appointment of persons providing security; govern the qualifications, training, duties and oversight of persons providing security; govern the exercise of the powers of a person providing security, including powers as a peace officer; and impose duties on the operator of the restricted-access facility with respect to the provision of security services under the act.

Madam Speaker, it's important to note that adding other categories of infrastructure other than nuclear and electricity generating facilities would require amendments to the act and could not be achieved simply by a regulation. The process for changing an act is very transparent and open, and the content of any proposed amendments is subject to public debate, and that's key for us.

Throughout the legislative process and on an ongoing basis, we will continue to consult with our partners to

ensure our proposed legislation works. By talking to all parties, ensuring we listen to their input and concerns, we are much better positioned to maintain the general consensus we have achieved so far.

We now have proposed legislation that protects critical Ontario installations and respects the rights of its citizens. Madam Speaker, I enjoin the members of this House to support this bill. Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for Scarborough—Agincourt.

**Ms. Soo Wong:** I'm honoured to follow Minister Meilleur and rise in the House to support the Security for Courts, Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012.

As the minister has stated, we need to modernize the legal framework for the protection of some of our most vital infrastructure and of our courthouses. We know that despite the fact that the Public Works Protection Act is used in a limited fashion, it is relied upon on a daily basis to provide security at our nuclear and electricity generating facilities and Ontario courthouses.

As we move to repeal and replace the PWPA, I believe it's important to look back at the situation that was facing our predecessors when the act was enacted.

The origin of the PWPA goes back to the start of the Second World War. At that time, our predecessors in the House were worried that our power plants might be sabotaged. In fact, our predecessors were so concerned that on September 19, 1939, the House convened for an urgent and extraordinary session to adopt this law. Our records show that the law was adopted in under three days and with bipartisan support.

I have some quotes here from the leaders of the day, to give you a flavour of the importance of the PWPA at the time. In a *Globe and Mail* article dated September 20, 1939, the Conservative opposition leader, George Drew, was quoted as saying that "he agreed with the act and would support it. [With] the country at war, it was necessary to protect hydro, the railways, public works, and industries linked with war production."

Premier Hepburn was even more blunt. In the same article, he was quoted as follows: "The greatest service a Nazi sympathizer could do would be to destroy these plants."

Fortunately, there were no attacks on our facilities. The war ended, but the law stayed on our books and drew little attention. In short, you might say that the PWPA was an early form of anti-terrorism legislation.

But a lot has changed since 1939. For example, the general criminal law, modern federal anti-terrorism legislation and provincial emergency legislation give our police services the tools to prevent, investigate and manage the fallout of terrorism. In other words, we would not create any legal gaps for ourselves by repealing the PWPA and replacing it with the legislation we have proposed for the facilities that make use of the current act.

In addition to the threat of terrorism, some stakeholders have asked how the proposed legislation might

impact security during the 2015 Pan Am Games and similar major events.

Police have powers under common law and statutes such as the Criminal Code of Canada to enable them to maintain public order when this is required. Temporary security for major events is generally dealt with at the local level by the police of jurisdiction and affected municipalities. The province will work with stakeholders to ensure an appropriate and effective security plan is in place for the Pan Am Games.

The bill before the House achieves a balance between the need to provide powers to protect certain facilities where the need for that protection is not questioned, against the desire to use those powers in a way that minimally infringes on our civil liberties.

The bill certainly responds to key recommendations made by former Chief Justice Roy McMurtry. In his report, Mr. McMurtry concluded that there was a need for the continued protection of these installations, but found the original PWPA to be an outdated legal tool with too broad a definition of what constitutes a public work. He therefore recommended the repeal and replacement of the PWPA. That's what the McGuinty government is doing.

Ontario is the largest nuclear jurisdiction in North America. There are 16 nuclear reactors capable of generating electricity and supplying Ontario with energy to power our industries and light our homes.

But whereas nuclear installations in Quebec and New Brunswick are in remote areas, two of our most important nuclear generating stations are in Durham region: Pickering and Darlington.

Our challenges are different. Securing these facilities requires balancing the powers given to those protecting them with the rights of Ontarians who reside nearby or conduct recreational activities near these installations.

The replacement legislation would allow for the current use of the powers granted under the PWPA for security at courthouses, nuclear facilities and large electricity generating facilities.

But there are differences in how these powers would be applied, and they are in line with what we have heard from Mr. McMurtry and the Ombudsman in their respective reports.

One such area where we have not replicated the powers found under the PWPA is for the so-called "approach" to a prescribed facility. This is particularly relevant for our partners from the nuclear sector.

The PWPA currently gives guards the authority to exercise their powers in the approaches to a public work. The approach to a facility was a concern for Mr. McMurtry and civil liberties groups because it is vague and hard to define.

Under our proposal, guards could exercise the specified powers only on the premises. These powers would not apply off the premises. Since the approach falls outside the premises of the nuclear facility, any security issues should be addressed in partnership with the police of jurisdiction.

While we may have heard diverging opinions on this particular issue during our thorough consultations, the proposed legislation has broad support among all key stakeholders. I believe this to be a just reflection of the balanced nature of the bill.

We know that the G20 summit in Toronto in June 2010 led to many questions on the usefulness of the PWPA. A security-led event of this magnitude is uncommon, even for a large city like Toronto. The hectic pace of the events during those few days in June highlighted the tremendous pressure our police services can face in such situations. However, Madam Speaker, Ontarians are protected by some of the most professional and best-trained police officers in the world. What we needed to focus our attention on was protecting some of the most vital infrastructure.

#### 0930

As the minister stated, more modern and focused legislation ensures that critical facilities can be protected. That is why we are moving with the repeal and replacement of the PWPA. We are doing so in the spirit of openness and transparency. We have consulted with all the sectors involved, from the municipalities to the police organizations, from civil liberties groups to power companies, from Canada's nuclear regulators to provincial ministries and Canadian federal departments. We have been thorough, and that's one of the reasons behind the broad support for this bill.

The replacement legislation is focused on what we know to be the current uses of the PWPA for security at courthouses, nuclear facilities and large electricity generating facilities. Owners of other public works and the police have sufficient authority to address security needs at these facilities under other legislation, including the Trespass to Property Act.

It is one of the motivations behind our decision to make the addition of any new category of infrastructure possible only through legislative amendments. Changing an act is, by its nature, a transparent and open process. The content of any proposed amendment is subject to debates in the House and in committees. Public input would be sought. Once again, Madam Speaker, the process will be open and transparent, and that's essential for us in helping to maintain the trust of Ontarians and for them to know that their safety and the respect of their charter rights is paramount for our government.

If a member of the public wishes to conduct business inside a courthouse or if they wish to enter a nuclear or electricity generating facility, they will have to abide by the security procedures. However, if someone does not wish to subject themselves to these security measures, they have the right to simply walk away.

All Canadian provinces have some form of legislation in place that specifically addresses court security and powers of court security guards. Our proposal is generally consistent with the legislation in other Canadian jurisdictions.

We have made provisions in the proposed legislation to ensure that the PWPA is not repealed before all

necessary measures to protect courthouses and nuclear and electricity generating facilities are in place. There will be no gaps in ensuring the safety of these vital facilities while regulations are being developed.

The accompanying regulations will be developed in partnership with our stakeholders. The ministry will undertake further consultations on the regulations. At a minimum, however, regulations will be needed with respect to the prescribed facilities and the appointment of guards before the repeal can be proclaimed. The regulatory framework will be clearly spelled out.

In summary, we believe that the proposed legislation strikes a just balance between security and civil rights when it comes to protecting Ontario courthouses, electricity generating plants and nuclear facilities.

We are making our law more modern to reflect the values shared by Ontarians, values that have evolved since 1939 and the start of the Second World War. We no longer fear saboteurs operating in the dark of night and menacing our power and water treatment plants, our dams or our bridges. We need no longer depend on a piece of legislation drafted more than 70 years ago to know that our critical infrastructure is secure. We rely on sophisticated police services and more modern legislation to deal with the unexpected.

We need to update how we protect our vital installations and civil liberties. Madam Speaker, our proposed bill does that. I enjoin the members of this House to support this legislation.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. John O'Toole:** It's a pleasure to be here today to listen to the leadoff on Bill 34, and I'm waiting for our critic Mr. Yakabuski to give a definitive assessment of what I believe is a long-overdue look at this thing. In fact, before they invoked some changes during the last G20 meetings here in Ontario, they should probably have looked at it then.

I can only say this: that in the interest of my constituents on the issue around court security as well as other power plants, it's important to have the right rules and procedures in place at all times. In fact, I suspect even today, many members of the Legislature have visited the facilities within their riding, whether it's a nuclear plant or other facility—and they have very adequate and very stringent security requirements today, I believe.

I've been to the Darlington plant; I know other members have been there as well. And the Pickering and Bruce plants are all very much up to scratch. They don't need some interventions.

There's a bit of concern on my part on the court security part of it. I've been to court as a visitor many times. I've never been there on a charge; I've actually been a witness to things. I know others who have been there for a charge.

The point is, I hope they don't create a lot of red tape. When they talk about openness and transparency, which many of the members have talked about—the questions in the Legislature in the last few weeks have all been

about the lack of openness and transparency. I was expecting, the other day, that the Minister of Health would stand up and resign because of the lack of openness and transparency in the Ornge helicopter incident.

I suspect that, on this side, our critic will make our position very clear. We'll listen carefully. I hope this will go to committee and that you'll be open to amendments that might be brought up by the opposition. In that respect, I think it's the right thing to do.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for Parkdale–High Park.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Make no mistake: During the G20, behind closed doors, the Premier of this province got together with a handful of people—we don't know who they were; we will never know—invoked a secret regulation that nobody knew existed, quite frankly, in the province of Ontario, and with a stroke of a pen took away civil liberties from everyone in this province and in this city. That's what happened. The New Democratic Party called for a public inquiry, as did the civil liberties association—it never happened. We did get an investigation. It made several recommendations. But make no mistake: This was a terrible time.

I was on the streets with others during those days, demonstrating. On the Sunday, as a United Church minister, I held a joint worship service down on King Street—a worship service that was broken up and dispatched by people in riot gear. Madam Speaker, this is not how a democracy works. And might I remind everyone in this House, this was while the House was in session. Not once did this Premier ask for even his own backbenchers' input, never mind the rest of this House—not once. This is unprecedented in our democracy. Even during the two wars, when the Parliament met in Ottawa, they did so with the other parties—they did so in secret, but they did so with the full consent of other parties, not just a handful of people.

Not since, I might mention, the War Measures Act—another Liberal head of state, Pierre Trudeau—have our civil liberties in this country been so egregiously breached. So here we have an attempt to rectify that. We say, too little, too late.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for Peterborough.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Thanks very much, Madam Speaker. I did listen intently this morning as Minister Meilleur provided her leadoff and then as my colleague from Scarborough–Agincourt talked about the need to bring in Bill 34.

I thought the member from Scarborough–Agincourt certainly provided the historical context. We know that Canada declared war in September 1939, about three days after it was declared by Great Britain. There were a number of measures that were brought in, provincially and nationally. Of course, the federal Parliament of Canada brought in the War Measures Act, and here in Ontario we brought in the Public Works Protection Act. If you read the newspapers of the day, the *Toronto Star*,

the Globe and Mail, the Toronto Telegram—of course, we know the United States didn't enter the war until December 1941, two years after Canada had declared war, and there was this feeling that there was going to be a rash of Nazi sympathizers who were going to come across the border, the Great Lakes etc. and sabotage facilities right here in the province of Ontario. So we look at that. Legislation was brought in at that particular time to deal with circumstances some seven-plus decades ago that were quite different from what we face today.

0940

Of course, we know the War Measures Act that was sitting on the books in Ottawa for many, many years was certainly changed and a successor piece of legislation was brought in. Indeed, Bill 34 will become the successor piece of legislation of the Public Works Protection Act.

There will obviously be the opportunity for Bill 34 to go to committee to be reviewed extensively at committee. We'll hear from many, many groups. But it's certainly clear, post-9/11, that there is a need to have a piece of legislation to protect the security of key facilities in this province.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Ms. Sylvia Jones:** I'm pleased to provide some preliminary comments to Bill 34.

Clearly, this piece of legislation is a reaction to; this is not an initiative that you had intended to bring forward. This is something that you were forced to bring forward, based on Chief Justice McMurtry's and the Ontario Ombudsman's reports.

What we saw, and we were referencing it earlier, is a reaction to what happened as a result of the G20 and the secret regulations that were passed prior to, without knowledge and without any public consultation or input, let alone any consultation from the other sides and participants in the Ontario Legislature.

It was a shameful time to be passing regulations and not notifying the public or the members of the Ontario Legislature of what you had passed in secret, and we saw the fallout, quite frankly, with G20.

So I'm pleased that we have brought forward something, but I'm not going to allow you to delude yourselves into thinking it's something you wanted to do. It's something you were forced to do as a response to two very—how shall we say?—pointed reports that came out from Chief Justice McMurtry and the Ontario Ombudsman. We needed to have those initiatives come forward before there was any reaction or action from this government.

So, while I'm pleased to see Bill 34 come forward—obviously, a piece of legislation from 1939 needs to be reviewed and updated—let's not pretend to think that you did it because you wanted to. You did it because you were forced to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The minister has two minutes to respond.

**Hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** Let me say thank you for the comments of the MPPs from Durham, Parkdale-High Park, Peterborough and Dufferin-Caledon.

First of all, let me say also thank you to the Ombudsman and also to Chief Justice McMurtry for the good advice that they gave us.

I'd like also to say thank you to Nathalie Des Rosiers, who is the general counsel for the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, who helped us to put forward a piece of legislation that will cover our nuclear facilities, our courthouses and our electricity generating facilities.

The question was asked if it's going to committee. Yes, when we have committees, it will go to committee, and I hope to get other input. But there was widespread consultation with people from all walks of life, including our police forces, the civil liberties groups and our judges.

We need to protect our courthouses, and also we need to protect our nuclear and electricity generating facilities. I look forward to more discussion on this. But the PWPA is not going to be repealed before we have this piece of legislation.

I will also invite the federal government to act on protecting our nuclear facilities, because it's in their domain but they have not acted yet. After consultation with them, they're not ready to act to cover the nuclear facilities, but those workers in the nuclear facilities want to be protected. Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate? Yes; the member from Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Thank you, Speaker. I move adjournment of the debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member has moved adjournment of the debate. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*Second reading debate adjourned.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Orders of the day?

**Hon. John Milloy:** No further business, Madam Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** There being no further business, this House stands recessed until 10:30 of the clock.

*The House recessed from 0945 to 1030.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** It's my great pleasure today to introduce, in the west members' gallery, residents of Sarnia-Lambton here for the Ontario Good Roads/ROMA reception: Mr. and Mrs. Gary and Shirley Depooter, Dennis Chepeka, Leo Denys, Matt Deline and Jason Cole, all residents of Sarnia-Lambton and proud to be here in the Legislature with us today.

**Mr. Paul Miller:** It's my pleasure to introduce page Adrian Hucal's family, who are here to watch him perform his duties today; they're in the west gallery: his mom, Lesia Hucal; his dad, Morris Hucal; and his sister, Kalynna.

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** I want to introduce a very good friend and a great volunteer in my campaign, Michael Broeders, who is visiting from Ottawa. He is accompanied by Geoff Turner from my office. Michael, welcome to Queen's Park.

**Ms. Laurie Scott:** I would like to introduce Pat O'Reilly in the gallery, a councillor from the city of Kawartha Lakes and here for ROMA and Good Roads. Thank you for coming.

**Ms. Lisa M. Thompson:** I would like to welcome later this morning, in the public gallery, class 14 of the advanced agricultural leadership program to Queen's Park today. The program focuses on local, provincial, national and international rural and agri-food sector issues. I am a proud alumnus of class 6 of this program, as is Mark Wales, the president of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, and I can tell you first-hand what a wonderful learning experience it is.

Each class travels to Queen's Park as part of their 19-month program, and this year they are learning about social media and how to communicate the rural and agricultural message to Queen's Park.

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** I have plenty of guests here today from ROMA.

**Mr. Rod Jackson:** They're all yours?

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** They're all mine.

I have the mayor of Malahide, Dave Mennill; I have Anne Marie McWilliam, the wife of the mayor of Dunwich-Dutton; I have Wayne Casier, the councillor of Bayham; I have Marion Page, the wife of the councillor of Dunwich-Dutton, and Don Page, the councillor of Dunwich-Dutton; I have Paul Ens, mayor of Bayham; and Ed Ketchebaw, councillor of Bayham. I also have Bill Walters, mayor of central Elgin and also the warden of Elgin county. He's been waiting for a meeting with the Minister of Health, so hopefully her office will actually contact him.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further introductions?

In the visitors' gallery this morning, up on our side, we've got with us today in the House two students from the University of Akron Canadian studies work experience program. Please join me in welcoming Lindsay Powley and Will White as they begin their 10-week placement for the member from Nickel Belt and the member from Thornhill. Welcome to Canada.

As well, in the Speaker's gallery today we have, from the state Senate of New Hampshire, Senator Lou D'Allesandro, and Mrs. Pat D'Allesandro. Please give a warm welcome to our guests who are here today.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### TAXATION

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** My question is to the Premier. Premier, we have a jobs crisis in the province of Ontario.

In fact, there have been 61 consecutive months now, over five years, where Ontario's unemployment rate has been above the national average. I don't know if that's ever happened in the history of our province.

You at least had one idea to help make Ontario open for business investment again, and that was to hit a 10% business tax rate by 2013. The Ontario PC caucus wants to see Ontario again as the best place in all of Canada to find a good job, to start a business and to see it grow.

Premier, please tell us that you're not going wobbly when it comes to lower business taxes in the province of Ontario.

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, we will not waver in terms of the balance that we bring to our economic policy in Ontario.

My honourable colleague will know, for example, that just as we have reduced corporate taxes, adopted the HST and eliminated the capital taxes, so have we also invested record amounts in developing the skills and education levels of our people.

So what we're doing is working hard to bring that competitive advantage that consists not solely of the tax environment but as well the investments we're making in our human resources.

Where we really want to compete is at the highest end for the highest wages, the highest quality of life, the highest standard of living, and that's with the highest skill levels. That's what we're up to.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** But, Premier, you are wavering. You said you're not wavering, but evidently you are doing just that. For some time, you said you would hit a business tax rate of 10% by 2013; you said this was one of the best ways to attract those types of jobs to Ontario. In the last number of weeks, you and your finance minister have been wavering consistently on this.

The problem I have, Premier, is that businesses can invest anywhere in Canada, North America or the world. They want to make sure they have a stable approach when it comes to opening Ontario up for investment. That's the kind of province we in the Ontario PC Party would like to create.

Now is not the time to go wobbly and change direction; that sends a very dangerous signal to investors. So if you say that you're not wavering, can we then take that as a fact that you will ensure that we do hit that target of a 10% business tax rate by 2013?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** I appreciate the importance of being consistent when it comes to economic policy and tax policy in perspective, which is why from the get-go we supported the adoption of the HST in Ontario. We knew that would be a difficult thing for Ontarians to come to grips with. But my honourable colleague was at one point in favour of that, and then he stood against that. So I think it's really important he offers good advice with respect to consistency in terms of tax policy.

Adopting the HST has given a significant competitive advantage; it's a value-added tax. We've caught up to some 100 other countries around the world that have that

kind of a tax in place. It has given our businesses a competitive advantage. It wouldn't hurt for my honourable colleague to say it was the right thing for us to do as a government.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Again, this is my second day of pursuing this line of questioning the Premier, and he has yet to answer my question directly. We do have a motion in the Legislature tomorrow, so I guess we'll see—finally, we'll get to a point of certainty.

I do hope, Premier, in the next 24 hours you will reinforce your spine and that of your caucus to continue to make Ontario open for job creation. You actually were on the right path when it came to heading towards more open investment and lower business taxes on the business tax rate at 10%.

Now, I don't want to engage in a silly game of semantics—whether you want to call this a tax increase or a tax freeze—the reality is, if you get off this path, taxes will be higher in 2012 and 2013 than they otherwise would be.

When we have a jobs crisis in the province—we've lost 60,000 jobs since the election alone—surely you can tell us you've not changed your mind, that you will continue with this plan to hit that tax rate for 2013.

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** I want to assure my colleague that we will continue to bring a balanced and thoughtful approach to economic policy in Ontario.

We went ahead with the HST because it makes our businesses more competitive, but my honourable colleague voted against that. We reduced corporate taxes in the past because we thought that would make our businesses more competitive, but my honourable colleague and his colleagues voted against that. We eliminated capital taxes in Ontario; they voted against that. We reduced small business taxes in Ontario; they voted against that. We have measures in place now that effectively reduce the tax on new business investment in Ontario by one half; they voted against all those measures.

So Ontarians know on whose side we stand. We're in favour of balance. We're in favour of a thoughtful approach to make sure Ontario businesses remain competitive so we can support our health care and our schools.

## TAXATION

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Back to the Premier. It's regrettable that we see this sort of sophomoric approach from the Premier when it comes to a very important issue. For the Premier to suggest that we were against lowering taxes on job creation or on consumers is ludicrous and it's a distraction from the question that I'm bringing to him today.

1040

The Premier says they're taking a balanced approach. I'll make this point, Premier. You made an early, reckless

decision to actually increase business taxes: You moved them up to 14%. You increased them on manufacturers and on small businesses. Then you changed your mind and said you would lower them, and now it appears you're going to go back on that yet again by having higher taxes in 2012-13. So, Premier, this is the farthest thing from balanced; this is actually a rollercoaster ride that you're taking businesses on in the province of Ontario.

I ask again: Do you think that makes Ontario less attractive for business investment, when you keep going up and down, back and forth on this very important issue?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** In fact, our cuts to the corporate sector, starting with the elimination of the capital tax, followed by harmonization of the collection of corporate taxes, followed by the lowering of corporate taxes—we've taken the manufacturing and process rate down from 12% to 10%. We've taken the general rate down from 14% to 13.5%.

We brought in the HST on the advice of the chamber of commerce and a variety of other business organizations. The member and his party voted against it, Mr. Speaker.

There has to be balance in public policy, and as we face the challenges of the coming year we will continue to take a balanced, fair and responsible position on all of the choices we make. We think that's the right way. We think we've done a great deal for the business community and we want to continue to work with them.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Back to the Premier if I could, Speaker.

Premier, your finance minister cited the chamber of commerce. I'll remind you that the Ontario Chamber of Commerce, in a recent pre-budget submission, said this: "A reduction in corporate tax rates is the most helpful initiative for helping businesses in the short term and improving long-term competitiveness." So the chamber of commerce would agree with the PC caucus that hitting that 10% tax rate will make Ontario open for investment.

You know, you do have a debt crisis; there's no doubt. You've spent us into a big hole. But you can't cut your way to prosperity; you also need a growth plan, Premier. You need a jobs plan. We've put forward ideas like modernizing our apprenticeship system to create 200,000 skilled jobs; an energy approach to make energy reliable and affordable. An essential part of that is to make sure we keep those tax rates at 10%. Effectively, you'll have higher tax rates. How can we attract jobs if you're increasing taxes on businesses in Ontario?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Let me read a quote from the Ontario Chamber of Commerce, from their Emerging Stronger document, page 6, which says: "Ontario's overall tax environment has improved over the last several years, thanks in part to the elimination of the capital tax and the adoption of the ... HST. These changes are

helping Ontario become more competitive and productive." We couldn't agree with them more, Mr. Speaker.

We will continue to strike a balanced approach in tax policy and expenditure policy. That's why we're looking at every recommendation in the Drummond report. We're taking advice from others—I've done a variety of town halls across the province—and I look forward to making the right choices to take a fair and balanced approach as we move forward across tax policy, expenditure policy and in the management of our assets and liabilities.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** You know, Speaker, I guess it's obvious. The vote is tomorrow, but we can hear pretty clearly from the finance minister and the Premier that they're abandoning the plan to have a 10% business tax rate. Effectively, taxes will be higher on job creators. We'll get to the vote tomorrow. I view this with sadness, but not surprise.

To the Premier's comments in the papers today, where he is going after Alberta and the oil sands: Premier, there used to be a time when Ontario strode across Confederation with pride and with confidence, and it shows how far we've fallen that the Premier of the province is trying to pull other provinces down. I have a different suggestion: Instead of pulling other provinces down and playing this game of envy, let's make Ontario strong again. Let's invest in our province, make us attractive, and the best way to do that: help to lower business taxes in the province—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Thank you. Minister of Finance?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** To the Premier.

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** I appreciate the opportunity—I sincerely do—raised by my honourable colleague to speak to this.

First of all, I want to say to Canadians living in every part of the country outside of Ontario: On behalf of the people of Ontario, I want to thank them for working so hard and so well, contributing to a strong Canada.

I also want to assure all Canadians living outside of Ontario that Ontarians are doing their share. We're focused on building a stronger economy. We understand that our greatest strength is our people. That's why we're going ahead with full-day kindergarten. That's why we're increasing our test scores and our graduation rates. That's why we've increased accessibility to our post-secondary institutions. That's why the enrolment rate is way up. That's why we have one of the highest levels of education for our graduates in the western world.

We're doing our part to strengthen Canada, we're committed to this cause, and we thank all Canadians who are equally committed to the great cause of our country, a strong country built on a strong Ontario.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Sit down, please. Sit down, please. Thank you. Order, please.

Leader of the third party.

## EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My question is to the Premier. Speaker, the Premier and the Minister of Health have indicated that Dr. Chris Mazza's \$1.4-million paycheck at Ornge was inappropriate. My question to the Premier is, can he cite a figure that he thinks is more appropriate than \$1.4 million?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Health.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you for the question. I think what's really important here is that we have made decisive changes in the leadership at Ornge.

We have a new interim CEO, who is working very hard to bring about changes that matter to the people of Ontario and to the front-line staff at Ornge. We have an excellent new board that is very engaged in ensuring that we have excellent air ambulance service in this province.

There is good change happening. This morning, I went to the Ornge air base here in Toronto. I spoke to front-line staff, and what I hear from them is that they see the change that is happening and they look forward to more of that.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** That's the obvious problem: They can't cite a figure that's more appropriate.

Over the last several decades, the salaries at the top levels of our health care system have increased dramatically. In fact, just over the last couple of years, they've increased dramatically, sometimes exponentially. As we first saw at eHealth and now we see at Ornge, the business for consultants and lawyers has been extremely lucrative. Does it surprise the Premier at all that people think that the health care system in Ontario is a place where they can get rich?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** The member has raised this issue before, and I have to tell you I share the concern. That is why we are working with the Ontario Hospital Association and the hospital organizations to really develop a framework that makes sense to the people of this province.

We do want our hospital administrators to be well paid—they do very, very important work—but we need to have a framework where we can explain to people why those numbers are what they are.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Member for Northumberland—Quinte West, come to order.

Leader of the third party.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Families who watch emergency rooms close and waiting lists grow are tired of seeing health dollars spent on everything but patient care.

The scandal at Ornge is going to keep on unravelling, but the Premier can take steps in this very budget to change the culture in Ontario. Will he crack down on the growing reliance on private sector consultants and private

sector solutions, and put a cap on skyrocketing salaries of our executives and CEOs in the public sector? Or is much more of the same from the Liberal government all we can expect?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** The Premier has actually asked the Minister of Finance to look at this very issue, to bring forth some options not just about the health care sector. There are issues about senior leadership compensation right across the broader public sector.

We need to make sure that every dollar we spend goes to better patient care. That's part of the mandate of this government and it's part of the mandate of the Minister of Finance.

1050

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My next question is to the Minister of Health. In a letter to the editor, former Minister of Health George Smitherman wrote in reference to Ornge: "That the ministry did not conduct proper oversight, and did not ... understand what was happening at Ornge, is a commentary on my successors and the ministry."

My question to the minister is, does she agree with her predecessor's assessment?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I fundamentally disagree with the opinion expressed in that letter to the editor. We are taking very strong actions at Ornge to change the way that business is being conducted there. I have now visited three bases. I have spoken to groups of front-line staff, and they tell me that they see a noticeable difference, a noticeable improvement, in just the few weeks that we have had new leadership in place.

Do they see there's more to do? Yes, they do. But are they very encouraged and very optimistic about the changes at Ornge? Absolutely.

I'm proud of the work they do. I will never apologize for praising the work of front-line staff, Speaker. They are doing superb work and I am very grateful for that.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** I'm quite shocked that the minister was amused by my question. It's quite disturbing.

The former minister went on to write this: "No piece of legislation is perfect and 'unintended consequences' are very normal, but you only learn of 'unintended consequences' if you are engaged. It seems clear that nobody at" the Ministry of Health "has been very interested in those helicopters flying overhead."

Does the minister agree with her predecessor that she failed to engage?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** From the first time I heard about issues at Ornge, I asked questions. We have gone through a deliberate process, Speaker. It came to the point where I became satisfied that Ornge was not interested in providing answers—not to me, not to my ministry officials and not to the Auditor General of Ontario. It was then that I had a meeting in my office

with the senior leadership at Ornge and I said to them, "Provide this information. You are required to provide this information. I expect you to provide this information." Within only a few days, they started to supply some information around salary disclosure. It was very troubling. It is then that I sent in a forensic audit team, because I knew that there was trouble at Ornge. I sent in a forensic audit team. They did their work and handed it off to the Ontario Provincial Police.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, in the same letter, Mr. Smitherman continues: "Pretending that the" Minister "of Health," who "provides about 90% of Ornge's money, was or is powerless to correct any operational deficiencies ... is not credible."

The minister needs to answer some tough questions that she has been avoiding, frankly, for years. Did she, as her predecessor maintains, fail to do her job, or did the former minister and the Premier who appointed him fail to do theirs?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I think that the people of Ontario want to know what we have done to fix the problem and what we are going to do to make sure it never happens again.

We will be introducing legislation to amend the Ambulance Act. It will include provisions similar to those we have in hospitals, such as enabling the government to appoint a supervisor or an investigator in exceptional circumstances. It will give the government ability to appoint members to the board of Ornge. It will allow the government to prescribe terms of a performance agreement with the government of Ontario. We will introduce a new performance agreement, and it will carry the provision that any changes to the corporate structure must have the approval of the minister.

We're making change, Speaker, and the change is for the better.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** To the Minister of Health: The scandal continues to grow at Ornge. The Minister of Health continues to boast about new leadership at Ornge, and yet the two individuals who were responsible for the operational decisions that put patients at risk are still there. Rick Potter continues as chief operating officer, with Steve Farquhar as the vice-president of operations. Both were responsible for dispatch protocols that delayed launch times. Both were involved in the purchase of helicopters that, quite frankly, were unsafe so that paramedics couldn't even conduct CPR.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Question?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Both were involved in circumventing procurement policies. I'd like to ask the minister this: How did these two individuals manage to negotiate their immunity? And, at the end of the day, I'd like to know from the minister: Was she lied to about their involvement—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. I'd ask the member to guide his time. When I say "question" or when I say "answer" for all members, it's approximately 10 seconds afterwards; I'd ask you to wrap up very quickly, please.

Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** The member from Newmarket–Aurora has obviously been focused on this issue, and I just want to compare and contrast some of the advice he has given us, Speaker.

On January 26, Mr. Klees said, "The new board is headed in the right direction. These are competent people." But then, last Thursday, the very same member said, "We haven't placed qualified people at the head of Ornge."

On February 14, the member opposite said, "The performance agreement was a flawed agreement." On February 28, just two weeks later, he had a complete change of opinion and he said that the performance agreement very clearly stipulates that the Ministry of Health has oversight responsibility.

The member opposite claims to have raised this issue repeatedly in the House. Last year, out of 360 questions, Speaker, three were on Ornge.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Speaker, why does the minister not know that Rick Potter was intimately involved in the purchase of the Agusta helicopters and signed off on interiors that didn't even allow paramedics to administer CPR?

By now, she must also be aware that the same Rick Potter, who is part of her management team, lied about having an MBA and allowed that to be published in a prospectus to woo international investors in Ornge.

Speaking of MBAs, the minister must also be aware that Steve Farquhar, who is now two years away from retirement, is continuing as a diligent student of the \$90,000 MBA program being paid for by Ornge.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Question?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Front-line staff, paramedics and pilots want to know why those two people are still running the operation. Can the minister—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Minister of Health?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I have put in very strong leadership at Ornge. They are doing their job.

Some of the decisions that the member opposite has raised have been reversed. The interiors of the helicopters are now able to accommodate CPR. They are able to accommodate people who have to sit upright. I have had front-line paramedics demonstrate to me exactly what those changes involve. It is not the long-term solution, but it absolutely is a short-term solution.

The front-line paramedics talked to me about Ornge changing the protocol for immediate takeoff. There was a delay put in place. That delay now has been removed by the new leadership.

The changes are being made. We will do our part by bringing in new legislation, and the people at Ornge are doing their jobs.

## AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** To the Minister of Health: In news reports today, Ornge's aviation chief said that he knew about a \$6.7-million payment from Agusta-Westland to Ornge Peel, Chris Mazza's spinoff for-profit company, allegedly in exchange for marketing services related to the purchase of 12 helicopters for \$144 million. Can the minister say whether \$6.7 million worth of work was done for this for-profit company?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** On this question, I have to say: We need to let the OPP do their work.

I called in a forensic audit team. They spent several weeks with a very large team of auditors. It came to the point where I had to ask the OPP to investigate this. We must not jeopardize any investigation, and I for one want to see justice done. That will happen only if the OPP is given the authority to conduct their investigation.

1100

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Minister, the Financial Times reported last evening that Finmeccanica, a parent company to AgustaWestland, is facing a probe in India over financial irregularities involving a €560-million purchase of 12 helicopters. An Italian investigation into corruption in 2011 forced the chairman of this helicopter company to resign.

Can the minister say whether the OPP's investigation involves this helicopter company?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I simply will not comment on the OPP investigation, and I would urge the member opposite, if he has any information that might be helpful to that investigation, to please share that with the Ontario Provincial Police.

Speaker, this is a chamber. We all have the same goals. We want to see integrity at Ornge. We want to see excellent air ambulance service. A critical part of that is that we let the OPP do their work.

## FULL-DAY KINDERGARTEN

**Ms. Dipika Damerla:** This morning my question is for the Minister of Education. Minister, as we all know, these are very challenging times for Ontario. We've gone through a very tough recession during which this government made a number of much-needed investments to keep the economy going, and now it's time to turn our attention to eliminating the deficit. We know that the Drummond commission has made a number of recommendations on this, including several on education.

One of these recommendations is the elimination of full-day kindergarten. Now, this has caused a lot of concern in my riding of Mississauga East–Cooksville because parents intuitively know that full-day kindergarten is not only about giving the best start to their

children, but it's also about helping parents save money on child care.

Minister, can you please tell this House what—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Minister of Education?

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** I want to thank the member from Mississauga East—Cooksville for her advocacy on behalf of the families she represents.

Speaker, we have worked very hard over the last number of years to rebuild the public education system after some very, very challenging and very difficult times under the previous government. We have got our test scores up, we've got our grad rates up, and now we're building a historic new investment in our earliest learners called full-day kindergarten.

We understand and know the importance of full-day kindergarten to families in this province. Registration is happening right now, and that's why we've been very clear that we're going to move ahead with full-day kindergarten. We will invest more than \$1.5 billion in full-day kindergarten by the time that it's fully rolled out. And next year alone, Speaker, we'll invest an additional \$300 million.

We will make the tough choices, but I can tell you we will always put the education of our children first.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Dipika Damerla:** Minister, thank you for that response. I know that some members of the opposition have publicly said that they would eliminate full-day kindergarten. They have said that investing in our youngest learners is something we cannot afford. I'm so proud to be a member of a party and a government that is committed to education because education is the only way Ontario is going to continue to be prosperous.

When this party took office, we worked to restore confidence in our publicly funded education system. I know that in my riding of Mississauga East—Cooksville, there are now 41 full-day kindergarten classes across eight schools. I know that kids in my riding and across the province are benefiting from a world-class education, but I also know that these are tough times and, as the Premier has said, we have some tough choices to make.

Can the minister tell this House what our plans for education are, given our fiscal realities?

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** Leadership is about making those tough choices, and I can tell the people of Ontario that we will always choose to put our children first. We will choose to invest 300 million new dollars in full-day kindergarten next year, and that's in sharp contrast to the opposition, who, when they have a choice, when the Leader of the Opposition has a choice to decide where he will make cuts—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order.

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** —where he will suggest cuts, his go-to place—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order, please.

Member?

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition always makes his first go-to place public education, and I can tell you that we stand in sharp contrast to that. We will invest \$300 million into public education and more full-day kindergarten next year. And we will make the choice: Rather than horse racing, we will put children first. Those are tough choices. That's what Ontarians expect. We will make those choices for the kids in this province.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** My question is for the Minister of Health. With each passing day, it becomes more apparent that the minister does not know what is happening at Ornge and that the public's confidence in her ability to provide oversight is eroding. But not only is the public's confidence eroding, the confidence of the employees at the Ministry of Health is as well.

We have a leaked memo from your ministry indicating that the 10 new helicopters purchased by Ornge are not permitted to enter American airspace and transport patients to US destinations. Minister, can you confirm that Ornge has not received FAA approval to enter American airspace?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** What I can tell you is that the front-line staff at Ornge have expressed in no uncertain terms their full support for the steps we are taking at Ornge. I've now visited three bases. I have had full and frank discussions with people about the challenges they face.

There is no question that the steps this government has taken to put new leadership in place, the decisions that the new leadership has made, are making a difference in the lives of these front-line workers. They feel that they've got the ability to exercise their scope of practice in a way they didn't have before. They're seeing positive change, they're seeing the benefit to the patients they serve, and I know that they know that we're doing the right thing.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** Mr. Speaker, the minister's lack of response to a simple question is unbelievable. You don't know what's going on in your ministry. You don't even have the information in your head that's in your briefing notes. It now is up to staff at the ministry to continue to provide information about what's going on at the air ambulance service.

Not only is there no approval for these aircraft, but we've also learned that local ambulance EMS services are not aware of the fact that they might need to be available.

I say to you, Minister, in light of the fact you don't know what's going on, will you step down and resign?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Sit down, please. Be seated, please. Thank you.

Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** To answer the question, no, I will not resign. I've got a lot of work to do, and I'm doing that work.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Member from Renfrew, come to order, please.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:**—regarding the question of the certification of the new aircraft in the United States is that these planes are, of course, certified in Canada, and we are waiting for approval in the United States. The aircraft are safe; they are doing their job. These are excellent new aircraft. We have highly trained pilots who are flying them.

We are taking the appropriate steps to ensure we have excellent care for the people of Ontario.

### PAN AM GAMES

**Mr. Paul Miller:** My question is to the minister responsible for the Pan American and Parapan American Games. In January, Paul Henderson raised the alarm bells that the Pan Am Games are going over budget. The government said that everything is fine but refuses to open the books to the public to prove what they are saying is true.

Speaker, will this minister confirm for us right now whether there are cost overruns—and how much are they?

**Hon. Charles Sousa:** I appreciate the question from the member across the way. I also appreciate the input and the concerns raised by others who have advised us of their issues, keeping in mind, of course, that to date—and I can assure you—less than 3% of the budget has been spent, and that is because we're still negotiating the venues and preparing the plans.

We are doing our utmost to maintain everything on time and on budget. I'm very confident with what is being done up to this point.

We should all be very proud, Mr. Speaker, of the work done by all of us who are welcoming the Pan Am Games to Ontario. It's going to produce over 15,000 jobs for this province. It's going to provide a legacy of athleticism, social engagement and, more importantly, economic progress.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?  
1110

**Mr. Paul Miller:** Because you have spent 3% of the budget doesn't mean there aren't going to be overruns. The last time the financial information for the Pan Am Games was updated was in 2009, Minister. Ontarians demand to have current and regularly updated financial information. New figures have been promised, but we're still waiting to find out when they will be released.

Speaker, why won't this minister reassure Ontarians that the Pan Am Games are on budget and release the financial updates now? We want to know now, not when it's all over.

**Hon. Charles Sousa:** We have independent assessments of the budget being made. Pricewaterhouse-

Coopers has been involved; Deloitte and Touche has been involved with the federal government. All levels of government are involved with the direction of the Pan Am. Ontario has taken the extra steps of putting conditions on our approvals with the Toronto 2015 committee. They are doing their utmost.

We are still negotiating the venues. For us to now proceed to suggest which ones they will be and at what price would be inappropriate, because then we're establishing the price ahead of the proponents. Let the people do their job transparently and effectively, and within a few months we should have everything out.

I am anxious to advise the entire province of where we're at, but we need to take the proper steps to get there first.

### SKILLED TRADES

**Mr. David Oraziatti:** My question is for the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities. The skilled trades are an essential part of Ontario's economy, and our government has worked hard to attract more people to the skilled trades through investments in apprenticeship programs and infrastructure upgrades to our colleges and training centres.

As a result of these efforts, there are 120,000 Ontario apprentices learning a trade today, nearly 60,000 more than there were in 2003. Moving forward, Ontario will need to train even more skilled trades workers, and the modernization of the apprenticeship and skilled trades system is critical to meeting the future demands of our economy.

Some industries have expressed interest in playing a larger administrative role in the apprenticeship system, but we must remember that our highest priority is ensuring that administrative decisions are made with the health and safety of all Ontarians in mind.

Minister, how are you ensuring that these individuals in the skilled trades industry have a voice through the College of Trades?

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** We have an excellent board at the College of Trades. We have now elevated the College of Trades to the same level of lawyers, nurses, teachers and others with professional colleges. So for the first time in Canada and the first time in Ontario's history, people in the trades are there.

The other thing that's rather extraordinary about this, Mr. Speaker, is this is an extraordinary partnership between business leaders, labour leaders and educators, who are looking at the details of what kinds of ratios and what fields should be covered.

Mr. Speaker, I was leaving work yesterday and I ran into a young fellow who had done all of his training in information technology and decided to become a plumber. We had a college—he was listening to this and he said, "You know, I don't want one-to-one ratios. I went through this. I couldn't have done it. I couldn't have gotten safe training without a two-to-one ratio." He said, "Why does government think?"—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. David Oraziotti:** Thank you, Minister. Speaker, as the minister has indicated, the skilled trades are a key contributor to Ontario's economic prosperity. The economic success of the province depends in large part on the support we provide to our skilled tradespeople. We need to ensure that every Ontarian who wants to pursue a skilled trade has the opportunity to do so. That's why the College of Trades is a great organization which helps to raise the profile of the skilled trades sector.

The establishment of the College of Trades has been an important step that has put the skilled trades in the spotlight of Ontario's core economic strategy. Constituents in my riding have impressed upon me the importance of reviewing the apprenticeship ratios in Ontario.

Minister, can you tell us when the College of Trades will start reviewing apprenticeship ratios?

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** The College of Trades, which only started operating barely two months ago, has already announced that the first set of ratios will be reviewed beginning in April, Mr. Speaker, just over a month from now.

Our government is proud that for the first time in Ontario history, the trades themselves will now be able to regulate and govern themselves, rather than government doing it.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Sault Ste. Marie knows, because we've talked about this, that I've challenged the opposition to produce the math on where these mystical 200,000 jobs are, since they could never produce more than 60,000 apprenticeships. We're already at 120,000.

So I'd like to invite them to rooms 228 and 230 at 4 p.m. this afternoon, where the College of Trades, business and labour leaders and educators will be from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. to answer questions from the opposition and government, so they can get their facts straight.

### SKILLED TRADES

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** My question also is to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities. Minister, as you know, you and the College of Trades are having a partisan reception here today. They're also asking you for \$31 million to fund them next year, a 500% increase.

My understanding is that travel and accommodation are being paid for by the College of Trades to attend this partisan event, which will amount to tens of thousands of dollars.

This is a completely government-funded organization, funded by the taxpayers of this province. Minister, you and your government brought in tough new rules which prohibit government-funded agencies from lobbying the government.

Minister, can you tell the House today who is paying for this event? And is one cent coming from your ministry or the taxpayers of Ontario, or is this another Working Families Coalition exemption?

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** I shouldn't have stayed home and watched Saturday Night Live; it's not as entertaining.

Ron Johnson, I think, sat in your caucus. I think he's a manager and a former Progressive Conservative member from Brant, Mr. Speaker, which you'd be familiar with. I think that almost half of these folks are business leaders.

Now, not only is your math wrong on that, but could my critic explain where the 200,000 jobs are? Because I've talked to most business leaders and most labour leaders and they can't get to the same numbers you do. They can tell me that when you were in government, you couldn't deliver 50%.

This very low-cost College of Trades event, which is non-partisan, is open. I would suggest, on behalf of all the hard-working students taking apprenticeships, that the member opposite show them respect and show up at the reception and learn a few things.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** Maybe you'll take time out of the reception and come down and answer a late-show question, because you didn't answer that one.

Minister, I ask again: Tens of thousands of taxpayer dollars are going to a partisan reception to supply you with booze, canapés and fancy cheeses. The event is occurring here today at 6 p.m. in room 228, where you and your PA are speaking. The official opposition were not invited to speak at this partisan event.

The Ontario College of Trades is seeking a 500% increase in their budget. Is a fancy, taxpayer-funded reception all it takes to get your government's attention a month before the budget? Is that all it takes?

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** Mr. Speaker, in the most platonic sense of the word, I would invite the honourable member to be my date at the reception tonight. Every single member of the House is welcome. I am afraid it's much more a tap water than a champagne event.

Mr. Speaker, their math is so bad on this. Now I know how they get the fiction of 200,000. We're at 150,000 right now; our goal is 365,000.

We know that this government has led an economic renewal that has created greater demand for apprenticeships than ever before.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Answer.

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** A little humility from the member opposite, who couldn't even produce half the number of apprenticeships that we have produced—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:**—rather than all this hubris—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. A second reminder for all members: When I say "Question" or "Answer," only a few seconds to wrap up, please, as a reminder.

New question.

### LONG-TERM CARE

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My question is to the Premier. In 2007, the Premier promised a new long-term-care facility at Windsor's long-abandoned Grace hospital site.

Four years later, no beds were built and the site remained derelict.

1120

Then, in the 2011 election and that campaign, the Premier promised \$2 million to clean up the site, saying that work would begin shortly and calling it a “guaranteee.”

Can the Premier please provide an update on this work?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Health.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** It's quite appropriate that there be a question, because the Ontario Long Term Care Association is here today, and I welcome this question on this day. I'm very pleased, Speaker, to be able to say to this House that progress is being made on the new long-term-care home in Windsor. As I understand it, those proposals, those tenders, are out now, and construction is slated to begin as soon as possible. These are important beds in Windsor. They do have a significant ALC challenge; we're aware of that. Unfortunately, the old site simply did not work out as originally had been hoped, but we are looking forward to a new home in very short order.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** I am asking specifically the question about the old site; perhaps the minister didn't hear that part of the question. The fact is that no money has flowed from the province and the site remains derelict.

After years of dithering and mismanagement of this file by the province, the Premier is now threatening to walk away and leave the city of Windsor to deal with this mess on their own. Can the Premier and the Minister of Health ensure that the funding that they promised voters during the election campaign in October remains available to Windsor after March 31 so that this eyesore on that former site of Grace hospital can be fixed once and for all for the people of Windsor?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** The answer to the question is yes. The commitment that was made remains a commitment to the people of Windsor. It does appear that there are asbestos issues, perhaps, at that site, but the commitment was made and the commitment will be honoured, Speaker.

#### ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

**Ms. Helena Jaczek:** My question is for the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. Minister, as you know, Ontario wildlife, from bears to coyotes, can be so abundant that they prey upon and damage agricultural livestock, poultry and crops. Farmers recognize that wildlife damage is an inherent risk which they accept as part of being a farmer. It's when the damage rises to intolerable levels that they turn to government for help.

Mr. Speaker, could the minister please inform the House what steps have been taken to ensure that farmers are adequately compensated for their losses to wildlife damage?

**Hon. Ted McMeekin:** This Ontario government understands full well that wildlife damage is a serious concern to our farmers. So, working with farmers and through the Agricultural-Wildlife Conflict Working Group, we developed a program that better responds to these concerns. It came into effect July 1, 2011. This new program expands both the variety of wildlife species included and the types of livestock that can be compensated.

In two years, we plan to review this program. If changes need to be made to make it better, we'll make those changes.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Helena Jaczek:** Thank you, Minister. I know that farmers across rural Ontario will be pleased that the government has implemented a modern, effective compensation program. Farmers know that wildlife damage negatively affects farm incomes, and there is a concern that Ontario keep the rates in line with current livestock and poultry values. They want to see the compensation schedule kept current and have adequate compensation paid to farmers for livestock losses.

Mr. Speaker, can the minister share with the House what, if any, steps were taken on revising the compensation schedule?

**Hon. Ted McMeekin:** I want to thank the honourable member for her question. We're very, very proud of this initiative that was developed, with the help of farmers, through our government's Open for Business program. That's the way policy should be developed. We listened to producers, who said that the program's compensation schedule needed updating. Guess what, Mr. Speaker? We updated the schedule, offering 100% compensation for the value of livestock and bee losses. Simply put, the Ontario wildlife damage compensation program gets the job done for our Ontario farmers, and we're proud of that.

#### ABORIGINAL LAND DISPUTE

**Mr. Toby Barrett:** I have a question for the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. Today marks six years of the McGuinty government tolerating the illegal occupation of a subdivision in Caledonia—six years of chaos, intimidation and home invasion.

Last week, out of the blue, you proposed in this House to get all parties to discuss potential uses for Douglas Creek Estates. The reaction I got from people was, “What?” and, “Why would you consider this?” Further questions: Who will be at the table? Where will they meet? When will this happen? How much will it cost?

Minister, will you please enlighten us? What is going on?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** It is the contention of our government that it's very important that where there is a conflict that has festered, that has been latent, that has not been dealt with, then it is better to bring people to the table to speak about that, to try to resolve it and to move forward.

I think that it is incumbent on all MPPs—if there ever were an issue that was not partisan, it's issues to do with our First Nations people: land claims issues, social issues and issues of community cohesion. So it seems to me that it is incumbent on every member of this House to do everything we can to bring people together to resolve conflicts.

I can't tell the member opposite dates and places and times, because we don't have agreement from everyone. But I'm working with the mayors, I'm working with the First Nations; I'm working to bring people together to have that conversation.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Toby Barrett:** Just to follow up on land claims issues, when you announced discussing potential uses for DCE you stated, "It's important to remember that at the heart of the matter is a 200-year-old land claim."

Minister, there's no land claim. There are a number of valid land claims along the Haldimand tract area but not on Douglas Creek Estates.

Chief federal negotiator Ron Doering noted in November 2007 that "in this particular case, Douglas Creek is not a valid claim ... I've consistently said that Douglas Creek Estates is not a valid claim."

A year later, Doering wrote a letter: "It is Canada's view that in December 1844 Six Nations surrendered the Hamilton and Port Dover Plank Road lands."

Minister, I ask again, why are you meeting to discuss future joint uses for an illegally occupied subdivision that, according to the federal negotiator, is not a valid land claim?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Well, the member opposite is wrong on all counts. First of all, I am meeting to try to bring people together. I am trying to play a facilitative role because I think that we need to move this issue forward.

If there's anyone that I'm not going to have a conversation about a land claim with, it's the member opposite. The federal government needs to be at the table. Land claims are at the heart of this issue. What I believe is that in order for this community to heal from the rifts that have been created, in part by the member opposite, we need to bring people—

*Interjections.*

**Interjection:** You have to relax.

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Well, she has to speak loudly to be heard over Lisa MacLeod.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Please.

**Mr. Ted Chudleigh:** When in doubt, raise your voice.  
*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Minister.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** I'm happy to speak quietly. I'm happy to tread softly.

What we need is, we need people to come together, and most of all we need the federal government to be part of this conversation. We can talk with the First Nations, we can talk with the mayors, but we absolutely need the federal government to take part in this. The fact that they are denying that they have a role, that they are stepping

back, is a real problem. Although I think the member, your federal counterpart, is saying that there does need to be a—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

## INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** My question is to the Premier. Speaker, in their election platform, the Liberals promised to create a new fund—a new, permanent fund—for municipal roads, bridges, to help communities and municipalities with their infrastructure deficit.

Yesterday, the government flip-flopped and cancelled the fund. Can the Premier tell municipal leaders, many of them who are here today, how he expects cash-strapped municipalities to keep their aging roads, their highways and their hundreds and hundreds of bridges in good repair without this badly needed support?

1130

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** I appreciate the question, and I know that Minister Chiarelli is, as we speak, meeting with delegations at the Good Roads and ROMA conference.

Mr. Speaker, we've been very clear, and over the last eight years we have made record investments in infrastructure across the province, including roads in the north and in the south, and we will continue to do that.

What we are working on right now, Mr. Speaker—and we have had many conversations with municipalities—is an asset management project, and the municipalities know that in order to be able to make the investments that we need, we have to make sure that we have the asset management process in place. We need to know where the bridges are that are of concern; we need to know what the other infrastructure issues are.

We're working with municipalities, we've invested in the municipal database and we will continue to do that—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** Investments in infrastructure are one of the best ways to create jobs and to spark economic growth. We heard from the people at ROMA yesterday; they know where their bridges are. Some of the municipalities had 35 bridges in a municipality with 500 people.

Businesses, farmers and families rely on Ontario roads every day. Municipalities need long, predictable funding, as you promised in your election campaign, to address their roads and their highway repairs. They need it in an efficient and cost-effective way. Can the Premier explain to municipal leaders why their government is abandoning its permanent roads and bridges fund—and when municipalities and Ontarians need it most?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** So here's what we're going to follow through with. We're going to continue upgrading the services that we committed to: \$3 billion

worth of services, Mr. Speaker, that were downloaded on to municipalities that we are continuing to upload.

And what we have said—and the Premier said it yesterday in his remarks—is that at this time, at this moment, we're not able to go ahead with that fund. That in no way means that we will not continue to invest in municipalities, and in fact, as I said, that \$3-billion upload, that is the biggest benefit that we could put on to municipalities.

So we'll continue to work with them. We understand absolutely how important infrastructure is, which is why we have put four times more per capita into infrastructure spending than the previous government did. We're going to continue to upload those—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

### PAN AM GAMES

**Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti:** My question is for the minister responsible for the Pan Am Games. Minister, people in my riding are excited about the 2015 Pan Am Games coming to Ontario. The games will attract thousands of tourists, help promote physical activity and focus international attention on all that our province has to offer. It will also stimulate millions of dollars of investment in supporting facilities, transportation, infrastructure and Ontario communities. For instance, the University of Toronto's Scarborough campus is benefiting from these investments with its new aquatic centre, which is scheduled to be complete in 2014.

Recently, Minister, you announced that construction was beginning on the revitalized West Don Lands, which will host the athletes' village. Minister, can you please tell the House what the project involves and how it will serve the games?

**Hon. Charles Sousa:** Thank you to the member for the question. Earlier this year I was very pleased to announce the beginning of the construction of the Pan/Parapan American Games athletes' village, the first and the largest construction project of the games.

By winning the 2015 games, we've been able to accelerate the pace of redevelopment of the waterfront community in the West Don Lands. The milestone project will bring new jobs: more than 5,200 direct and indirect jobs, including 700 construction jobs on that site. This project will build a new waterfront community that will be the temporary home for more than 10,000 athletes, coaches and officials during the 2015 Pan/Parapan American Games. The village will be a great place from which athletes and their families can experience Ontario's many world-class cultural and tourism attractions and experiences.

### NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Pursuant to standing order 38(a), the member from Simcoe North has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his

question given by the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities concerning the cost of a reception. This matter will be debated today at 6 p.m.

There being no further deferred votes, this house stands adjourned until this afternoon at 3 p.m.

*The House recessed from 1135 to 1500.*

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** On behalf of the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care, they may not have arrived yet, but I'd like to introduce some guests in the members' east gallery from the Ontario Long Term Care Association: Chris McKey, Sandy Lomaszewycz, David Cutler, Patrick McCarthy, Lois Cormack, who is chair of the OLTCA board, Daniel Kaniuk, Brock Hall, Shirley Thomas-Weir and Sheri Annable. I remind all members that they're having a reception this evening in the dining room.

**Mr. Joe Dickson:** I rise on behalf of myself and the member from Pickering-Scarborough East, who is at the far end on this side. I'm looking up and I'm sure these are my students from Pine Ridge Secondary School in Pickering, who I'm going to speak about in a moment.

### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

#### GOVERNMENT'S RECORD

**Mr. Monte McNaughton:** I want to address the comments that were made by the Premier yesterday when he blamed the decline of Ontario's manufacturing sector on the success of the Alberta oil sands. Instead of looking in the mirror and accepting fault, our Premier has stayed busy by pointing the finger at Europe, then at the United States, then at the federal government, and now, shamefully, at the province of Alberta.

Make no mistake: The Premier has only his own failed and tired policies to blame for the mess that Ontario is currently facing. Under the McGuinty government, Ontario became a have-not province for the first time in our history. Under this Premier's watch, 600,000 Ontario men and women have lost their jobs, and under this Premier's watch, we are staring directly at a debt approaching \$411 billion in 2017.

Instead of looking for a scapegoat, the Premier should realize it is his own government's policies and mismanagement which have dug Ontario into a hole, policies like the Premier's expensive green energy experiment and mismanagement like the scandal at Ornge.

Instead of the blame game, Ontarians are looking for a government that can lead, that can make tough decisions and can help turn our economy around. Unfortunately, this government has run out of ideas and has chosen to blame Alberta's booming economy for its many failures.

**DOUG RAPELJE**

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** Today, I rise to recognize a well-known gentleman in Niagara and Welland riding who has dedicated over 55 years to various organizations and groups to help and improve senior services, and to congratulate him on being named a recipient of the 2011 Ontario Senior Achievement Award late last year.

Doug Rapelje, who is 78 years old and a resident of Welland, has spent his lifetime working and volunteering in various capacities in the battle of making things a lot better for our growing elderly population, whether in nursing homes or in the community.

He recalls beginning his commitment to seniors in the 1950s when he was working with the city of Welland and involved in an investigation of Sunset Haven retirement home. He witnessed what he could only term a "jail cell" at that time, with eight people to a room, and men and women segregated. He told the local Welland Tribune, "The whole thing was unbelievable." Doug became administrator of Sunset shortly after the investigation, and later director.

When the Niagara region was created in 1970, he became the administrator for senior citizens, a position he held for 25 years. As a matter of fact, in recognition of his years of service, the regional municipality named a new home for the aged in his honour.

He has constantly come to the plate, serving on numerous boards and committees, including the United Way, Alzheimer Society of Canada, Veterans Affairs Canada, the Niagara District Health Council, and the housing committee for the physically disabled.

**ANTI-BULLYING CAMPAIGN**

**Mr. Joe Dickson:** I rise today to introduce a young, compassionate and energetic school group from my riding of Ajax-Pickering. Motivated by the tragic suicide of Pickering student Mitchell Wilson last September, students from Pine Ridge Secondary School in Pickering reacted by building a campaign of hope for victims of bullying.

I had the pleasure of donating for T-shirts for our Premier and our Minister of Education—Premier McGuinty and Minister Broten—and myself when I met with the students. I also met with a couple of their teachers, particularly their principal, Debbie Johnson, and teachers Mr. Leung and Ms. Trentadue, and particularly four students I met with that particular day, and they were Cody, Brian, Sarah and a second Sarah. So it was a great day.

These students have named their campaign "i AM WHO i AM." I had the honour of meeting with, as I said, a number of them. By saying, "I am who I am," they are encouraging the acceptance and dignity of fellow students.

The "i AM WHO i AM" campaign has gained momentum. Thanks to their efforts and the support of the communities of Ajax and Pickering, they recently

reached a phenomenal \$19,000, and that number is still growing. These funds will go directly to six Durham region families dealing with the challenges of muscular dystrophy.

Mr. Speaker, I also have with the students today Chris Braney, the trustee for the area and vice-chair for the Durham board, as well as school officials. I'm truly pleased and I would like to say to you—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

**ADVANCED AGRICULTURAL  
LEADERSHIP PROGRAM**

**Ms. Lisa M. Thompson:** I rise today to increase awareness for class 14 of the advanced agricultural leadership program, which is coordinated by the Rural Ontario Institute.

For those of you unfamiliar with AALP, as it's known by its acronym, it is a 19-month executive development and personal development program for men and women in Ontario's agriculture and food industry.

Since 1984, AALP has been one of those few opportunities where individuals from across the agriculture, agri-food and rural sectors can come together and discuss issues impacting their industries. They also regularly engage with business, community and political leaders.

Graduates of AALP will use their skills and knowledge to lead changes and growth within the agricultural and rural sectors. These are sectors that already provide 164,000 jobs and represent 13% of our provincial GDP.

**RECREATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Mrs. Liz Sandals:** Last week, I was pleased to celebrate the opening of the Market Square ice rink and water feature at Guelph city hall. This infrastructure project is part of the revitalization of Guelph's downtown core and is the central feature of the new public space in front of city hall. It consists of an ice rink in the winter and converts into an animated water feature in the summer. Market Square has quickly become a focal point for family recreation and community events in Guelph.

This is one of 750 projects in Ontario that have moved forward thanks to a joint federal-provincial investment of \$380 million in recreation infrastructure. The federal and provincial governments each contributed \$500,000 to Market Square.

My riding has also benefited from several other federal-provincial investments to improve community recreational infrastructure, including a new video scoreboard at the Sleeman Centre; upgrades at the West End Community Centre; repairs and energy conservation at the Evergreen seniors' centre, which is celebrating 20 years this year; and new washrooms at Guelph Lake Conservation Area. A total investment of \$4.82 million in Guelph—a win for Guelph families and a win for Guelph's economy.

1510

### RON SCHLEGEL

**Mr. Michael Harris:** I rise today to talk about a member of the Kitchener–Conestoga business community who, through his leadership, has inspired others to make Waterloo region one of the best places in Ontario to do business. This year, Ron Schlegel was named the fourth recipient of Waterloo region's Barnraiser Award for his philanthropy and commitment to community. He also was awarded a Queen's Diamond Jubilee Medal earlier this month by Governor General David Johnston, again for his tremendous work in the region of Waterloo.

For Ron, success starts with a view that money should not be seen as an objective or a goal, but as a resource to benefit the community. Ron has applied this business philosophy to his job as a land developer and retirement home care provider to build neighbourhoods that promote social interaction, improve the quality of life for residents and strengthen the sense of community.

But Ron's impressive accomplishments began much earlier in his career as an academic. During his time as a professor of applied health sciences, Ron established the health studies and gerontology department at the University of Waterloo and developed both the master's and Ph.D. programs for these academic fields. Ron's passion for health care then led him to found the Schlegel-UW Research Institute for Aging in 2005 and co-found both the Centre for Applied Health Research and the Murray Alzheimer Research Education Program.

It is the work of people like Ron that makes me proud to represent the riding of Kitchener–Conestoga.

### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** I rise today to discuss a growing problem across Ontario. This problem is spreading across Ontario; the malaise is growing. The alarm was sounded in Bramalea–Gore–Malton and it continues in ridings like Brampton–Springdale, Brampton West and York South–Weston. It was the number one issue on the lips of constituents this past election in my riding. This issue is auto insurance.

Auto insurance is skyrocketing across this province. We are paying the highest rates in Ontario. Constituents have been coming to my office in droves, talking about their concerns. In fact, just last month, Andrew came to my office and told me that, after five years of having an absolutely clean driving record, one no-fault accident and a second at-fault accident, he was dropped from coverage completely. This is simply unacceptable.

I've received emails; I've received letters. Constituents have been coming by, complaining about this issue. In fact, the fact that we have now had recent legislation which has cut our auto insurance benefits in half—yet we have seen our own insurance premiums go up instead of going down.

Ontarians have even further seen the fact that just by living in one part of the city, their rates are almost double what they are in other parts of the city—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

### HEART MONTH

**Mr. Bas Balkissoon:** February is Heart Month. The Heart and Stroke Foundation's national campaign encourages Canadians to rally together to raise awareness and funds for the foundation.

We know that heart disease and stroke takes one in three Canadians before their time and is the number one killer of women, taking more women than all cancers combined. According to the Heart and Stroke Foundation's report card for November 2011, "Eight out of 10 Canadians know that heart disease and stroke can be prevented ... or treated by making healthy ... choices but they are focusing on the barriers rather than the opportunities" to achieve better health.

Through the generosity and compassion of volunteers, the Heart and Stroke Foundation is able to apply life-saving knowledge, education and advocacy that generate real results. To date, initiatives like Heart Month volunteers have helped to fund:

- research that has resulted in the use of a clog-busting drug that reverses the effects of stroke;
- in-utero and neonatal heart research that saves babies' lives;
- research that helps Canadians eat healthier and live longer.

So, thank you to the Heart and Stroke Foundation and all of their volunteers and donors for the vital work you do for Ontarians and all of Canada. Your work is vital and saves lives every day.

### AUTOMOTIVE CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE

**Mrs. Christine Elliott:** Creating severe weather is no longer exclusively in the hands of Mother Nature. At the University of Ontario Institute of Technology, located in my riding of Whitchurch–Oshawa, it's now possible to create an arctic blizzard, scorching desert heat or a driving rain at the flip of a switch. This unique weather machine is now part of the new Automotive Centre of Excellence, or ACE for short.

ACE is the first testing and research centre of its kind in Canada and, in many respects, the world. It was officially opened this past summer, and will be a magnet for business in Durham region, the GTA and throughout Ontario.

ACE offers a full range of test chambers, including one of the largest and most sophisticated climatic wind tunnels on the planet. In this chamber, they can create wind speeds in excess of 240 kilometres per hour, temperatures ranging from minus 40 degrees Celsius to plus 60 degrees, relative humidity ranging from 5% to 95% and, using what's called a "reconfigurable solar

array,” they can replicate the effects of the sun. The chamber is also hydrogen capable, allowing for advanced fuel cell development.

ACE is where the next generation of electric vehicles, new technology and products we haven’t even thought of yet will be developed, tested and validated.

ACE could also be used to train military personnel, rescue crews or competitive athletes. It has the potential to assist the movie industry or test anything that is subject to severe wind, humidity, snow, icing or desert heat.

Mr. Speaker, at ACE they are creating the perfect storm in the name of innovation.

### NOTICE OF DISSATISFACTION

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Pursuant to standing order 38(a), the member for Haldimand–Norfolk has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the answer to his question given by the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs concerning the proposal for discussions on the Douglas Creek Estates subdivision. This matter will be debated today at 6 p.m.

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

#### MASTER’S COLLEGE AND SEMINARY ACT (TAX RELIEF), 2012

Mr. Leal moved first reading of the following bill:  
Bill Pr3, An Act respecting Master’s College and Seminary.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Pursuant to standing order 86, this bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills.

### PETITIONS

#### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I have a petition here signed by a great number of residents from Oxford county, and it is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

“Whereas Tavistock’s Bonnie Brae Health Care Centre is an 80-bed, D-class nursing home that must be either rebuilt or closed by July 2014; and

“Whereas there is currently an application by a private operator to move the 80 licensed beds outside of Oxford county to the city of London, despite the recent opening of two other long-term-care homes in Middlesex county in 2010; and

“Whereas long-term-care wait times in Oxford county can be as much as 134 days longer than in Middlesex county; and

“Whereas Tavistock receives referrals from the nearby Waterloo Wellington CCAC, which has among the highest waits for long-term care in the province;

“We, the undersigned, request that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario retain these beds in Tavistock and seek partners to fast-track replacement of the Bonnie Brae as part of Ontario’s 10-year plan to modernize 35,000 long-term-care beds.”

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to present this petition. I affix my signature to it, as I agree with it.

### WIND TURBINES

**Mr. Todd Smith:** “Whereas the proposed Gilead Power project in Prince Edward county is currently planned for an area that the municipality has designated for another purpose; and

“Whereas it’s the opinion of real estate experts in Prince Edward county that the installation of the Gilead industrial wind factory will negatively impact property values and the tourism sector, which is vital to the economic success of Prince Edward county; and

“Whereas other jurisdictions have recognized that it is environmentally counterproductive to put industrial wind factories in important bird areas, such as the one that exists on the south shore of Prince Edward county; and

“Whereas that recognition was also accepted by the Senate of Canada through a unanimous resolution;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“That the public consultation period for the EBR project number 011-5239, also known as the Gilead project, be extended to April 1 to allow the community sufficient time to make clear their arguments as to the negative impact that the project will have on the people, economy and ecology of Prince Edward county.”

I agree with the petition and will be signing it.

### DIAGNOSTIC SERVICES

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** I have this petition from the people of the northeast, and it reads as follows:

“Whereas the Ontario government” is making PET scans “a publicly insured health service available to cancer and cardiac patients...; and

“Whereas,” since October 2009, “insured PET scans” are performed “in Ottawa, London, Toronto, Hamilton and Thunder Bay; and

“Whereas the city of Greater Sudbury is a hub for health care in northeastern Ontario,” with Health Sciences North’s “regional cancer program and the Northern Ontario School of Medicine;

They “petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make PET scans available” through Health Sciences North, “thereby serving and providing equitable access to the citizens of northeastern Ontario.”

I fully support this petition, will affix my name to it and ask page Sophia to bring it to the Clerk.

### ONTARIO PLACE

**Mr. Rob E. Milligan:** I'm pleased to rise today to table my first petition. If I may say, it is a noteworthy one, representing the initiative of an 11-year-old boy in my riding, Mr. Trevor Bruinix. Trevor has taken the proper steps in our democracy to collect 186 names of people who agree with an appeal that is short but very important.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas we would like to stop the closure of Ontario Place;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Stop the closure of Ontario Place."

I agree with Trevor. I've been there myself numerous times, and I'm pleased to affix my signature to the petition.

### KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I have a petition today from one of the great radio voices from Peterborough, Pete Dalliday, 1284 Hopewell Ave. I know the family well.

**Interjection:** The other great voice.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Well, there's two great voices in Peterborough.

A petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, Canada, draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to the following:

"Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada;

"Whereas real progress has been made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease, in particular the development of a bioartificial kidney;

"We, the undersigned, call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make research funding available for the explicit purpose of conducting bioartificial kidney research as an extension to the research being successfully conducted at several centres in the United States."

I agree with this and will affix my signature to it and give it to page Jason.

### HEALTH CARE FUNDING

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** This petition comes courtesy of Focus in Elmvale, a petition to restore medical labs Tottenham, Stayner and Elmvale and reduce lineups throughout Simcoe-Grey.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the consolidation of medical laboratories in rural areas is causing people to travel further and wait longer for services"—and, by the way, Mr. Speaker, the government isn't saving money: They have a hard cap on these labs; and

"Whereas it is the responsibility of the" McGuinty "government to ensure that Ontarians have equal access to all health care services; and

"Whereas rural Ontario continues to get shortchanged when it comes to health care" dollars: "doctor shortages, smaller hospitals, less pharmaceutical services, lack of transportation and now medical laboratory services; and

"Whereas the McGuinty government continues to increase taxes to make up for misspent tax dollars," such as at eHealth, "collecting \$15 billion over the last six years from the Liberal health tax" alone, "ultimately forcing Ontarians to pay more while receiving less;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the McGuinty government stops the erosion of public health care services and ensure timely and equal access to medical laboratories" in all of Ontario.

### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** "To the Legislature of Ontario:

"Whereas the current enrolment of Avalon Public School is 687 students;

"Whereas the student capacity of the school is 495 students, as determined by the Ministry of Education's own occupancy formula;

"Whereas the issue of overcrowding and lack of space makes it impossible for Avalon Public School to offer full-day kindergarten until the overcrowding issue is addressed;

"Whereas Avalon Public School is located in a high-growth community;

"Whereas the enrolment at Avalon Public School is expected to continue rising at a rate of 10% to 15% a year for the foreseeable future;

"Whereas the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board has made building a new school in Avalon a top capital priority;

"We, the undersigned, call on the province of Ontario and Ministry of Education to provide the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board with the necessary funding to build an additional school in Avalon, to open no later than September 2014."

I support this petition and send it forward with Michael.

### WIND TURBINES

**Mr. Michael Harris:** "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas there is a growing body of evidence confirming industrial wind development has serious adverse effects on host communities;

"Whereas over 135 people in Ontario have reported serious negative health effects from industrial wind development, and at least a dozen families have been bought out of their homes;

"Whereas Ontario's Green Energy Act has ended local planning control by stripping municipal councils of their rights;

"Whereas 80 municipal councils, representing two million Ontarians, called on the government to put in place a full moratorium on industrial wind development until an independent epidemiological health study is completed, proper environmental regulations and protections are put in place, and local democracy is restored;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Immediately put a moratorium on all industrial wind proposals; fund an independent epidemiological health study to develop safe setbacks; legislate those findings; develop stringent environmental protection standards for natural areas; and require all projects to comply with regulations based on science and local planning."

I will hand this to Kriti to take to the table.

### BAITFISH INDUSTRY

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** A petition to protect the use of live baitfish in Ontario.

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ministry of Natural Resources recognize and work with the live baitfish industry to ensure a viable, quality baitfish product for the anglers of Ontario."

I support this petition, I will affix my name to it and send it down with Ryan R.

### BAITFISH INDUSTRY

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further petitions? The member from York—no—

**Ms. Laurie Scott:** Haliburton.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brook.

**Ms. Laurie Scott:** I've moved west.

"Protect Your Rights"—petition to protect the use of live baitfish in Ontario.

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ministry of Natural Resources recognize and work with the live baitfish industry to ensure a viable, quality baitfish product for the anglers of Ontario."

I'm happy the Minister of the Environment is supportive over there, and I'll hand this to page James.

### WIND TURBINES

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas there is a growing body of evidence confirming industrial wind development has serious adverse effects on host communities;

"Whereas over 135 people in Ontario have reported serious negative health effects from industrial wind development, and at least a dozen families have been bought out of their homes;

"Whereas Ontario's Green Energy Act has ended local planning control by stripping municipal councils of their rights;

"Whereas 80 municipal councils, representing two million Ontarians, called on the government to put in place a full moratorium on industrial wind development until an independent epidemiological health study is completed, proper environmental regulations and protections are put in place, and local democracy is restored;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Immediately put a moratorium on all industrial wind proposals; fund an independent epidemiological health study to develop safe setbacks; legislate those findings; develop stringent environmental protection standards for natural areas; and require all projects comply with regulations based on science and local planning."

1530

I support this petition and send it down with Darren.

### BAITFISH INDUSTRY

**Ms. Laurie Scott:** From Jacob's Bait and Tackle—again, "Protect Your Rights"—petition to protect the use of live baitfish in Ontario.

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ministry of Natural Resources recognize and work with the live baitfish industry to ensure a viable, quality baitfish product for the anglers of Ontario."

And I'll hand this to page Grace G.

### RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** "A petition to restore local control:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Dalton McGuinty's Liberal government is forcing Ontario municipalities to build industrial wind and solar power generation facilities without any local say or local approval; and

"Whereas the McGuinty government transferred decision-making power from elected municipal" councils "to unelected and unaccountable bureaucrats, who are accountable to no one; and

"Whereas the McGuinty government has removed any kind of appeal process for municipalities or for people living in close proximity to these projects; and

"Whereas Tim Hudak, Jim Wilson and the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party have committed to restoring local decision-making powers and to building renewable energy projects only in places where they are welcomed, wanted and at prices Ontario families can afford;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the McGuinty government restore local decision-making powers for renewable energy projects and immediately stop forcing new industrial wind and solar developments on municipalities that have not approved them and whose citizens do not want them in their community."

I agree with that petition and I will sign it.

## WIND TURBINES

**Mr. Todd Smith:** This is calling for a moratorium on industrial wind as well.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas there is a growing body of evidence confirming industrial wind development has serious adverse effects on host communities;

"Whereas over 135 people in Ontario have reported serious negative health effects from industrial wind development, and at least a dozen families have been bought out of their homes;

"Whereas Ontario's Green Energy Act has ended local planning control by stripping municipal councils of their rights;

"Whereas 80 municipal councils, representing two million Ontarians, called on the government to put in place a full moratorium on industrial wind development until an independent epidemiological health study is completed, proper environmental regulations and protections are put in place, and local democracy is restored;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Immediately put a moratorium on all industrial wind proposals; fund an independent epidemiological health study to develop safe setbacks; legislate those findings; develop stringent environmental protection standards for natural areas; and require all projects to comply with regulations based on science and local planning."

I agree with this petition, will sign it, and send it to the table with page Jason.

## BAITFISH INDUSTRY

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I think we'll just about get this under the time, Speaker.

"Protect the use of live baitfish in Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ministry of Natural Resources recognize and work with the live baitfish industry to ensure a viable, quality baitfish product for the anglers of Ontario."

I support this petition, I affix my name to it and I'll send it down with Adrian.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

ATTRACTING INVESTMENT  
AND CREATING JOBS ACT, 2012LOI DE 2012 VISANT  
À ATTIRER LES INVESTISSEMENTS  
ET À CRÉER DES EMPLOIS

Resuming the debate adjourned on February 22, 2012, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 11, An Act respecting the continuation and establishment of development funds in order to promote regional economic development in eastern and

southwestern Ontario / Projet de loi 11, Loi concernant la prorogation et la création de fonds de développement pour promouvoir le développement économique régional dans l'Est et le Sud-Ouest de l'Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further debate?

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** Thank you very much, Speaker.

*Applause.*

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** Oh, and thank you all. It's a pleasure to rise today and add my comments on Bill 11, Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act, 2012—or, as I like to think of it, the "spend and hope for the best in economic development, McGuinty-style" act. But that's basically what it is—and here we go again.

I was doing counting as we were sitting and listening to petitions, and I thought to myself: We met for 12 days in December; we met for three days last week—that's 15; and this is our second day this week. That's 17 days that we've met since the last House rose last June. That's not an awful lot of time to be spent in this chamber debating the business of the Ontario people.

What it's come to is this: We're back in the business of spending on economic development—or, as I like to think of it, corporate welfare. This is not the way to stimulate Ontario and it's not any coincidence that Ontario finds itself, at this point, in the position that it is in, from an economic perspective. This is the same old Liberal government; this is not a new Liberal government. It doesn't matter what the numbers are. It's doing the same thing, and the definition of insanity, according to Mr. Einstein, is doing the same thing repeatedly and expecting a different result, so here we are.

This is about pulling the wool over the eyes of Ontarians, particularly southwestern Ontarians, only to increase our spending in the province of Ontario by about \$160 million.

Bill 11, the Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act: It sounds like a great idea. And this is something that I've said in debate many times in this Legislature: They title bills so amazingly that you think there's going to be a miracle once it's passed. But the fact is, it puts Ontario at greater risk of further financial difficulties, and this is what worries my party. This is what worries Ontarians in general. It's very much what worries the 600,000 or so people who have no job in the province of Ontario right now, and that has put Ontario in the unenviable position of 61 solid months—I guess it's going to be 62 in the next week or so—of being the laggard of Confederation, the last of all of the provinces and territories, in terms of the percentage of unemployment that we have right here in our province.

From everything I've heard from businesses—and I've talked to a lot of businesses around the province—and from my constituents, it cannot be business as usual with this Liberal government at the helm. You know, I recently spoke to a number of business people, and I can't refer to them by name for obvious reasons, but I'm thinking of one that happens to have a grant of some substance from the province of Ontario under an economic development initiative. I said to the gentleman

in question, "If you had not been offered this grant"—because the grant was offered—"would you still be doing what you're doing in the province of Ontario?" And he says, "Of course I would. It's not dependent on the grant." And then somebody else in the room said, "And if you hadn't purchased the company that you're operating, would you locate in Ontario?" The answer was, "Are you out of your"—and I'll leave the other word out—"mind?"

This is not because this person doesn't like Ontario. This is an Ontarian. This is a person who is making a comment from strictly a business perspective on what Ontario represents to him and to his company in the overall scheme of things, and they operate companies, or at least branches of the same company, in a number of different locations. So I'm not making this up as I go along: I'm talking from the experience of discussing this with business people, with constituents, who are very worried. They're worried about the kind of money that's being spent, the largesse of the government opposite in terms of how they spread the money around and what it is they actually intend to achieve with it.

Our party, as is well known, is about creating the conditions where people can succeed; where businesses can succeed because the conditions are right for that to happen. That party is about throwing money around so that when I or one of my colleagues gets up in this Legislature to ask a question of that government, the answer is always a spending answer—and anybody who's watching and listening and observes the machinations of this Legislature knows that's true: "We spent this much money, and that's why it's a good thing."

Well, folks, if you are watching on television, understand something: There is no such thing as government money. It doesn't exist. This is the people's money, and the people on that side of this chamber are responsible for the way it's administered and the way it's spent. And I've got to say, after these scant few days, numbering in the teens, in this Legislature, the act may have changed but the play is the same.

So it's time that the party opposite, the government of the day, just stops saying that they're looking for input and actually begins to listen to the straightforward ideas being put forward, and I refer in this particular instance to the straightforward ideas of Tim Hudak and the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party. You talk about a partnership? Listen to your partners.

The party opposite constantly talks about these great successes that they have made in attracting business and attracting investment into Ontario: "creating a sound economic environment in this province." A sound economic environment in this province? We've just heard from an independent economist, your economist—because the Liberals hired this economist. We have been unwitting participants in the charade that is the Drummond report. And what he said is that we're right on course for a \$30-billion deficit within the next five fiscal years. That's on a business-as-usual basis, and all we've seen so far is business as usual, so I guess we're heading for a \$30-billion deficit.

## 1540

If you add up what's going to be scored in deficits between now and then, we're looking at a total provincial debt north of \$400 billion. Now, let's just flesh that out a little bit for people who are observing at home and who don't necessarily work with words like "deficit" and "debt" and "interest" every single day of their lives. The deficit is what we're short by this year. So we're short by \$16 billion. Why? Because the government of the day has chosen to spend in excess to the point where we are \$16 billion short. If you add up all of the deficits scored each year by successive governments since Confederation, and we keep going on a business-as-usual basis, as this government seems bent on doing, we get to a figure called the provincial debt of I think it's \$411 billion, if Mr. Drummond is projecting accurately, by 2017-18. What does that really mean? To the average person at home, it's just numbers that politicians talk about. The folks at home just want to know that their services are going to be there, that their entitlements are going to be there when they need them and when they want them.

But the fact of the matter is, if you keep going on this course and you want to see what the result is when you don't respond to the economic pressures of the day, all you have to do is turn on the nightly news and take a look at what's going on in Greece, because that's the ultimate. Now, I'm not suggesting that we in Ontario are going to become Greece next year, but if you don't take action now, that is where you're going. That is the track you're on. That is the fear that we have. And it doesn't just affect us; in fact, it affects another generation even more than it affects us. It affects our children, it affects our grandchildren, it affects future generations, and we have to get off this particular treadmill.

So the whole idea that what we're looking at is a sound economic environment in this province as a result of bills like this one is laughable. Since 2003, Ontario has seen time and again a spend policy being put forward by this Liberal government. This is what businesses warned us about. This is what other countries have experienced. This is what economist Don Drummond, the Premier's hand-picked economist, has said, and he has been very specific.

You cannot continue to spend at the rate you have been spending. So he says that. I don't say it—well, I do, but I'm not the economist that the government hired. The province is in serious financial deficit, to the tune of more than \$16 billion. Again, he said it and the figures say it; I don't have to say it. Also, if the Premier and the Minister of Finance do not follow through with what their hand-picked economist has suggested, then we could be facing a \$30-billion deficit.

Since 2007, the McGuinty government has lost over 300,000 manufacturing jobs. They'll play the figures with you, but the fact of the matter is, if you're in the business that we are in here, we look at these numbers because these numbers are indicators for what the province is doing or, in this case, not doing. These numbers are indicators of the changing face of Ontario, the

changing face of administrations around the world as we shift from one type of economy to another type of economy.

You could say that there was some predictability about the fact that we would move away from such a rich manufacturing climate over time. However, if this was predictable, what you would have wanted to do is address it before it happened, and this was a grasshopper-and-ant story; it's a Nero-fiddling-while-Rome-burns story. But the fact of the matter is, here we are, and since 2007 the McGuinty government has indeed lost over 300,000 manufacturing jobs, decimating the entire manufacturing industry in this province, with little to no hope of recovery. We will not see that kind of business in the province of Ontario again.

So the question becomes, what will we see and how will we, as people who work in government or opposition, but generally public life and public administration, address this massive change? What we're discussing today is a bill that purports to be a part of that solution, Bill 11, the Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act. It doesn't make it so. Because you say you're going to attract investment and create jobs doesn't make it so. This is a policy that this government, for the past eight and a half years, has been overseeing. They've been on an economic development trend that involves this type of corporate welfare, and we wind up north of 8% unemployed, we wind up with a manufacturing industry in decline, and we wind up at the tail end of Confederation in a province that has 40% of the population of Canada. Why? These kinds of policies.

Is it any wonder that thinking people around the province who are actively engaged with the way the economy operates and is it any wonder that our side, the Progressive Conservative opposition in the province of Ontario, say, "You know, there has got to be a better way. You've got to find a way to stimulate an economy and make individuals and corporations want to invest or want to stay in Ontario. You've got to be able to do that by creating the conditions that make them want to stay?"

I might say at this point that there were questions in question period this morning that had to do with whether or not the Premier would stay the course on continuing to reduce corporate income tax, which is obviously an incentive for corporations to locate or remain in Ontario. He's evasive, and I'll take that to be a no. So we're going to put the brakes on bringing the corporate tax rates down, which represents a massive flip-flop on the part of the government. It inherited low corporate tax rates, bounced them up, and now says, "Oh, we did wrong," brought them down as recently as November and said we're going to stay the course. Now here it is February and we're not going to do that. I'm not sure that this government has any kind of an economic compass at all.

As my colleague from Lambton-Kent-Middlesex noted, at one point in this Premier's tenure we were losing 100 jobs per hour—100 jobs per hour. That's the kind of statistic that blows your mind and makes your head explode. It's kind of like that other statistic we like

to cite because it's true and it's terrifying, and that is that this government takes in a million dollars less per hour than it actually spends. So what we're doing is we're engaging in an exercise of unbridled spending, of which this bill is a part, we're not creating jobs as a result of it, which is the supposed end game, and we are losing 100 jobs per hour. How does that sit with good government? That is a shameful thing. It's shameful that this government has basically sat on its hands for more than eight years while the manufacturing sector of this province, once the largest single sector, is now not even a shadow of what it once was.

With all the government's posturing that they have been helping more and more Ontarians, we still have, as I mentioned before, approximately 600,000 people who are not working. We're not talking about people who don't want to work; we're not talking about people who are sitting on the dole because they want to be; we're not talking about people who like sitting home and watching old television programs. We are talking about people who, if it were available to them, would be out working right now. So it's not for lack of wanting to work or a lack of motivation on their part. Companies at this point—

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Mike Harris used to say that.

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** Companies, I say to the member from St. Catharines, simply do not want to locate in Ontario. Surely you want more business in St. Catharines. I have a good member from Simcoe-Grey who sits a couple of seats to my right here in the Legislature; he wants more business in his riding and sees this kind of policy as an impediment to that. I think everybody here wants to see more businesses operating in their ridings and wants to see every one of those 600,000 people have a job. And yet what we're doing is applying little Band-Aids we think are going to do something.

I'm seeing an article being held up in my face by the member from St. Catharines. It says something about a bright future. So you have one new company there. How many have you lost? That's the question that I would ask you. In any case, I digress.

Companies don't want to locate in Ontario. If they did, there wouldn't be over 8% unemployment, there wouldn't be a track, on which we have now embarked, towards a \$30-billion deficit, and there wouldn't be a government that thinks that its largesse is the lynchpin to creating jobs and stimulating the economy here in the province of Ontario.

We have become, basically, the investment toxic wasteland of Canada. How things have changed: from being the most prosperous to now receiving a large share of our budget through federal-provincial transfers and, yes, talking to Alberta as if it's doing something wrong by extracting the resources from its ground and somehow injuring Ontario, when Ontario was in the sun 20, 30, 50 years ago, all that time since Confederation, and this government almost singlehandedly has brought it down. And you want to blame it on others? Shame. This bill is about nothing more than tossing money at a problem and sweeping it under the rug.

**1550**

This past throne speech, this Premier promised over \$2.5 billion in additional spending—can you imagine, in a climate like this, \$2.5 billion in additional spending? Already, 19.2% of GDP is spent on the provincial debt. Do you know the statistic on provincial debt? We pay interest on that debt, and if there was a ministry of interest, it would be the third largest ministry in the province of Ontario. The Ministry of Health spends the most of our tax dollars, followed by the Ministry of Education—as it should be—and vying for second, and now in third, is the ministry of interest. Well, there is no ministry of interest. But you know what? It's going to be third if we keep going on this track.

How does this Premier plan on finding that additional \$2.5 billion? The province simply cannot afford to continue on this spending spree.

Earlier this month, another 500 Ontarians lost their jobs with the closing of the Caterpillar plant in London, Ontario. Companies are cutting their losses. They're jumping from the sinking Ontario ship, and it gives me no joy to say that.

I'm a proud Ontarian. I raised my family here. I worked in corporate Ontario, and if I weren't here that's what I'd be doing again. And the bottom line is, maybe I wouldn't have as much opportunity, and for certain my children and my children's children will not have that much opportunity.

But not all is entirely gloomy. We have a chance to turn things around. The Liberals have to take the report that they commissioned and they have to listen to what was recommended. If that report were heeded, then we could find a balanced budget in 2017-18.

I might say that our advice to this government on their report was—you had 362 recommendations. No, we don't expect them all adopted; we expect the advice to be followed. The advice from Mr. Drummond was, "Here are 362 recommendations that, taken in concert, will result in you getting off this track and balancing the budget by 2017-18."

But we know you're not going to take all 362 recommendations, so when you take one off the table, you have to put something else on the table that keeps you on that financial track. That's what we said. It's what we continue to say. It's not our report; it's your report. Get off your duffs and do it.

If this report is heeded, as I said, we can get to balance by 2017-18. However, as usual, this is a Premier who believes that he knows best. Speaker, Ontario is crying out for a change—change from the way business has been traditionally done in this province, change in the stale ways that the Liberal government has gone about attracting business.

I say we start investing in Ontario. I say that we put an end to the spending spree that the party opposite thinks is just fine. I say that it's about time that the McGuinty government stop using hard-earned taxpayer dollars to manage the crisis that they have, in their infinite wisdom, created. Our tax dollars are there to help Ontarians out,

not bail out a failing government policy, and that is exactly what we will get if we allow Bill 11 to pass.

This is a stopgap measure that accomplishes nothing except wasting more money. Remember, we're facing a debt level of \$411 billion within five years. Bill 11 may only add another \$2.5 billion, but it's another \$2.5 billion that, Speaker, I would consider to be yet another nail in the coffin of industrial Ontario, and this has got to stop now. Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Comments and questions?

**Mr. Michael Prue:** It is always a pleasure to listen to my colleague and friend from Thornhill. Although we come from different political perspectives, he is a man who takes his finance and his budgetry very seriously. And when you listen to him, he speaks, I think, the economic sense of the Right. He is castigating this government for their failures. He is talking about where they have gone wrong. He puts the blame quite clearly, in my view, where it belongs: on this government and their lack of action and appropriate action over the past eight years.

Where I disagree with him is that he has solutions which would only compound, in many ways, the difficulties that Ontarians have found themselves in in these past eight years. It seems to me quite clear that to anybody who is looking at the haves and the have-nots of this province, there are many people who are doing very well under this government and their tax patterns. There are very many businesses that are able to survive quite well, given all of the grants and the largesse and the things that this government seems intent upon doing.

The problem is—and he and I come from different perspectives—that the government seems to be trapped in their own ideology—or their own lack of ideology, if one attributes that to Liberals. They are trapped very much by their failures, and they continue to carry them out. I know where he comes from—I will have a different perspective in a moment—but I commend him, as always, for putting forward forcefully his own ideas, his own thoughts and his own solutions, and I surmise that he hopes the government will listen.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments and questions?

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** I have noted the comments because they're in contrast to some of the expressions I've heard in years gone by from one Norm Sterling—who we can now call him his name: Norm Sterling—who was bounced out of his riding in a coup d'état, a long and distinguished member from eastern Ontario, who said that indeed the eastern Ontario development fund was very helpful to eastern Ontario, despite the fact it was hatched in the Harris era. I don't mean the new Mike Harris; I mean the old Mike Harris from North Bay.

I suspect that if you were to talk privately to Senator Runciman, who has landed in the chamber that many have sought to land in, that being the Senate of Canada, as now Conservative Senator Runciman, you would see that he would have considerable support for it.

He can change my mind if he says this, but the present member for Leeds–Grenville, in his heart of hearts, recognizes the importance of a fund of this kind, because it has been extremely helpful to eastern Ontario. Indeed, the Eastern Ontario Wardens' Caucus is very supportive of that particular program, and one would think that the Western Ontario Wardens' Caucus would be as well.

I know that when a consultation was held in St. Catharines, our business community came together and was very enthusiastic about it, particularly the St. Catharines–Thorold Chamber of Commerce. The business development office of the city of St. Catharines and the regional municipality of Niagara were all supportive. They weren't negative naysayers; they were people who saw the virtue of this legislation and the fact that it could help our part of the province of Ontario financially.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** I just want to congratulate the member from Thornhill for an excellent presentation and the excellent job that he's doing as our finance critic.

Someone has to start telling Ontarians the full truth about the books of the province of Ontario. Clearly, the Liberal government has not done that. We've just had an election a few months ago. There was no mention of a \$30-billion deficit. They had to hire an economist, an outside person, to come in and tell the truth to the people of Ontario about what the books truly look like. The member from Thornhill, on behalf of the PC caucus today, is reminding the government and reminding the people of Ontario that we simply can't afford another economic development program.

Don't you find it ironic over there that the same day that your Minister of Economic Development, Brad Duguid, announced the cancellation of some 50 economic development programs, you're concocting this new one because it was a campaign commitment to buy votes? Let's be frank about it, folks. In order to pay for this expanded program for the southwest, you are raping, cancelling, other programs that presumably were, by your own account, working in the province of Ontario, or presumably they still wouldn't be around today. You've been in office for over eight years, so if a program wasn't working, we would expect you would have gotten rid of it by now.

The other thing is, it's ironic, on a day today where, this week, our Premier, for my first time in 21 years in this House, is dividing Canada by saying, "Alberta, would you please slow down? You can't be booming any more because you're killing the rest of Canada. Please stop selling oil to the world at world prices." He somehow wants us to give a discount on our barrels of oil that come out of the ground in the tar sands, give a discount and not make money because it's somehow affecting the Canadian dollar.

1600

"So, Alberta, stop doing what's right for the economy for the people of Alberta and for the people of Canada,

because we are now a have-not province." So Alberta's sending cheques to us now, folks.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Questions and comments?

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** I'm very privileged today to stand up in the House and give my little statement on Bill 11 that's being presented by the Liberal government.

One thing I want to make clear is, in my riding of London–Fanshawe we have had many, many job losses. Most recently, as we are all aware, Electro-Motive Diesel, Caterpillar, shut its doors on our workers and we've lost over 450 good-paying jobs with benefits. So, absolutely, I want those jobs in every region and in my region to be replaced.

This bill has some framework with regard to two things, continuing the eastern economic development fund as well as structuring a new southwestern economic development fund.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** I can't hear the comments and questions being made.

Continue, member from London–Fanshawe.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** There are a couple of concerns I have with regard to this fund. The amount that's being placed in investment, \$20 million for the southwestern economic development fund: Really, if you look at the cities that it'll be servicing for funding, is it going to make enough of an impact to have jobs in place for the severely high rate of unemployment that this community is facing?

Job guarantees are also a real concern. With this government, we've seen time and time again that we need to have strings attached in order to guarantee jobs when we're funding businesses to do so.

So let's look at this bill. We need more details with regard to job guarantees and what contract terms are going to be in there so that these jobs are permanent, good-paying jobs in southwestern Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member from Thornhill has two minutes to respond.

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** Thank you very much, Speaker. I appreciate the comments of all members: the members from Beaches–East York, London–Fanshawe, St. Catharines and Simcoe–Grey for their comments.

Notably, my opposite number in the NDP caucus, the member from Beaches–East York, their finance critic, and I agree on many things. One of the things that we like to talk about when we compare Progressive Conservatives and NDPers is that we certainly have a different principle base in terms of how we come at problems, but we very much agree on a number of the different elements of the problems.

What I see in his comments is that that party is also concerned about the economic development of the province of Ontario. As my friend pointed out, we do come at things from a different direction, but we don't disagree on the problem that has to be solved. Indeed, he's correct when he said—and I made a note of it—that this government is trapped by its own nonsensical

perspective on the way things have to be solved. Eight and a half years, and yet you don't learn.

Nobody disagrees on the fact that we have to stimulate economic development in various sectors of the province and that various sectors of the province have different exigencies that we have to address. The issue is how you're going to address it. The way they always address things is, they take our money, roll it up into the equivalent of snowballs and just whack it at the wall and hope that some of it sticks. That is an inappropriate approach, dare I say.

As far as the member from Simcoe-Grey is concerned, he makes a very valid point that I should have mentioned in my own comments, so I'm going to say it again. We just noticed the very minister who introduced this bill a couple of weeks ago in this Legislature taking corporate welfare dollars off the table in the last 24 hours. That being the case, even this government is making a tacit admission that its approach to economic development is wrong. So, again, I say we cannot accept this bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I wish to preface my remarks here before we get into the meat of the bill by describing what I think is the current state of Ontario—the current state of the people of Ontario, the people who live and hopefully would like to work here.

Unemployment is stubbornly high. Unemployment in places this bill intends to address is even above the standards of Ontario or those of us who live in Toronto. Unemployment has reached double digits in the Windsor-Sarnia-London area. Unemployment has reached double digits in eastern Ontario in the Cornwall-Brockville-Smiths Falls-Renfrew area.

Go to those parts of the province and see what unemployment is like. See the despair in people's eyes. See the fact that there is nothing for them to do and that their children are not likely to remain in those towns or cities in the long term. The families will be rent apart. Children who have nowhere else to go will migrate, perhaps to Toronto, but more likely to western Canada. More likely, the job opportunities that they're going to see that they cannot find where they grew up, where they lived, where their families and friends are—those jobs are going to be found in Saskatchewan or Alberta or British Columbia or Manitoba. So you have the despair of those communities.

I do not blame a government for trying to help those communities. I wonder, though, whether what you are proposing is enough, whether it's adequate, whether it's aimed at the correct places.

Travel around. See some of these towns that once were vibrant in Ontario. See the mining towns, in a little bit, but especially the forestry towns in northern Ontario. See that they're not there anymore. See that the populations that were once thousands of people are reduced, in some cases, to a few hundred, most of them retired,

most of them unemployed, most of them with no hope, or despair—and in some towns, they can't even sell their houses: There is no one to buy them; there is no one who wants to live there. Their lifetime investment is worthless, save and except if they stay there with nobody around them and live out their declining and their final years in a ghost town.

Wages have stagnated. Wages have not increased for the people of Ontario since 1991, once you take inflation into account. That's 20 years that there has been no increase in the average wages of Ontarians, not in spite of all the economic boom times we had for a while, not in spite of the technology, not in spite of the hundred other factors that usually drive wages up. The wages in Ontario are the same today as they were in 1991. All the time, this government seems to be content with a growth rate that has hovered, at best, around 2%. It's pretty shameful.

Then you have the whole issue of corporate tax cuts. I listen to the Premier and I listen to the finance minister as they skate around this issue. I listen to my colleagues in the Progressive Conservatives, who obviously want even more corporate tax cuts, who want to drive us to the lowest corporate tax rate jurisdiction in the world, want us to pay less taxes to the corporations in Ontario than they pay in Mexico or Guatemala or any other jurisdiction that you might name. And I wonder, to what avail? We've gone from having a corporate tax rate of 44%, just before this government took office, to one which is now down to 25%—and I'm including here both the federal and the provincial corporate tax rates.

I have to ask the members opposite and, perhaps, my colleagues in the Progressive Conservative Party: Has business investment doubled? Their taxes have gone down by half in that period. Have you seen investments in jobs and technology and all of the other things one would normally expect? Have you seen it happen? Have you seen it doubled? Have you even seen it at all? Because the reality is that businesses are not investing in Ontario.

**1610**

They're not investing because we have a workforce that is lousy, because we probably have one of the finest workforces in the world. We probably have the best-educated workforce in the world. We have social programs, especially medicare and hospitalization, which is the envy of every single state in the union immediately south of us and probably of most of the world. We have an infrastructure here which is amazing. They are not investing because they don't have to. They are not investing because it's easier to take that money that you have given them in corporate tax cuts—and my colleagues in the Conservatives want to give them even more—and they're putting it in their pocket. Who can blame them? Who can blame these people who are given all this extra money for using it for their own purpose? They don't have to use it for the common good; they have to use it for their good, and their good can be their corporate executives or their stakeholders, shareholders or anything they want.

You know, don't listen to me. This is what's being said in the United States. This is what Warren Buffet is warning everybody about. The world's fourth-richest man is coming out there and chiding the governments of the United States for doing it all wrong, for allowing the rich to become super rich, to allow them to keep all of the money. And that ordinary people who look for that job, that opportunity for staying in their home, for seeing their community built—that's what this government's doing.

So here we have this program against that backdrop. Here we have a program that fails, I think, in three areas. The first one is that it requires no job guarantees. The second one is that it's taking much of the money and the allocations from other programs. We've learned just this morning that a whole bunch of programs which every single member in this House on the Liberal side has lauded for the whole eight years you've been over there—I've heard nothing but talk about the programs and how good they were and how they were working, to build jobs. Then today, the minister stands up in a place that isn't this House and he announces that 50 of them are being shut down and here's a little tiny one that's being allowed to continue.

And then last but not least, the paltry sum—and I say paltry—of \$20 million is being allocated. You know, when you look at government programs and when government gives money to business to develop—the government over there used to talk a lot about RIM, giving them \$8 million or \$10 million or \$15 million to create a couple of hundred jobs. How many jobs do you think \$20 million is going to create over there? How many jobs?

So let's go through them. Job guarantees: There's nothing in the bill that requires a job guarantee. We've all seen what just happened in London. We've seen when Electro-Motive shut down that there were no job guarantees, so a company could pocket the \$5 million—in that case, federal money—and simply walk away. Where is the job guarantee?

A progressive state someplace else—Minnesota, if you want to look—requires that there be a job guarantee for five years. If the jobs don't continue and expand as to the rate that the Minnesota government and the people of Minnesota gave them the money for, it is clawed back. Liberals should be pretty aware of that term, "clawback," because it seemed to be pretty easy to do for welfare recipients. Seems pretty easy to do for ordinary and poor people who are suffering on the margins. Why can't you claw back money from corporations that promise to create jobs and take the money in the first place and then don't do it? That's what Minnesota has decided to do and that's what is contained within their legislation. It's written in the legislation. It's not something that's by ministerial whim or prerogative. It's not something that's done in the regulations that's hidden from public view. It's part of the bill itself. If you don't produce what you promise to produce and keep it going for five years, then all of it, or a percentage of it, is clawed back, right from the legislation.

This government told one of our researchers, when we asked about this, "There's going to be a template that describes how we're going to be able to get some of this money back." But we're still waiting. No template has been produced by this government; nothing at all. There is absolutely nothing to this point that would give me or anyone else any confidence that you have any desire whatsoever to claw back monies when companies rip you off and rip off the people of this province by taking the money and then delivering nothing.

We need to do better. This government needs to do better. If you are going to put \$20 million of the people's money out there, then you had better make sure that there are some results from it. It's quite obvious that this government believes that 50 of your other programs that were extant until this morning didn't solve anything. What gives us confidence that this one will?

I go to the next point, which is the reallocation. Where is this \$20 million coming from? We ask the question: Can any of the members in the government tell me where the \$20 million—is this \$20 million of new money? Is it? It's not. The \$20 million comes from what is called re-allocations. I was not aware, when I was looking at this this morning, that there was going to be an announcement of 50 shutdowns of grants and programs. But primarily, this money comes from a little-known thing called the strategic jobs and investment fund—SJIF for short. What is being done by the government is taking the money from that fund to this new one. So what was the strategic jobs and investment fund? It's probably one of the 50 that were canned today. It was designed to support leading-edge investments and jobs in Ontario, not just in southwestern or eastern Ontario but in all of Ontario. It was to make Ontario a leader in looking for leading-edge investments and jobs.

It has been said many times in this House, particularly by government members, that the old manufacturing sector and the way we used to do business aren't the modern ones. That's a pity, because we still have to drive cars and we still need machinery and we still need clothes and we still need manufactured goods by the bushel for the people who live here. And it's a pity that when I or any of you go out to go shopping, you cannot find a shirt or a pair of shoes made in Canada or in Ontario. It's a pity that you often will have difficulty finding food you want to eat that comes from Ontario, and we produce some of the best. It's a pity that when you want to buy canned fruit, there are no canning facilities left in Ontario anymore around Niagara Falls, and all of those trees and orchards have been plowed into the ground. It's all a pity. It's a pity. But here it is: The government has said, "Those old days are gone," and what they've tried to lead us to believe is that we will have leading-edge investments for jobs in Ontario.

To quote from the ministry's own statement on the SJIF—and I think it's a wonderful statement—this is what the government said that that fund was supposed to do and obviously hasn't done. It's probably amongst the 50 that were canned this morning. I quote the ministry as

stating that it is “aimed at innovative companies that make anchor investments in Ontario that support cluster development and leading-edge initiatives that build long-term prosperity and global competitiveness.” That’s what’s supposed to be done.

Is that what’s being done in this new fund you’re asking us to support? Is that what’s happening in eastern Ontario or southwestern Ontario? I don’t think so, because we don’t even know how the money is going to be doled out. At least in the northern Ontario fund, there is a group that is set up, a non-partisan arm’s-length group, that looks at how the money might be spent and does it out proportionately to those ideas that benefit the communities in northern Ontario. In eastern Ontario and southwestern Ontario, the government isn’t even contemplating such a group.

1620

So it will be handed out, I’m sure, in the usual way governments hand it out: Who comes and makes the best deal; who comes and who they know; who comes and says, “You’ll get your best bang for the buck from me” and convinces you to do it. No arm’s-length, no further discussion—who the Liberals want to give it to is who’s going to get it.

Then you’ve got the whole issue of the \$20 million. What can that possibly do? What can \$20 million do that all of these other funds that have been canned today not do? Is \$20 million going to be enough to support large-scale industry? I don’t think so.

I look back to what this government did a couple of years ago—and I have no umbrage with what they did—when the auto sector in this province was under considerable financial pressure, when the likes of General Motors, Ford and Chrysler came forward and said, “We’re in a bad way.” This government put up hundreds of millions of dollars—hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars in order to save that industry and the 30,000 or 40,000 or 50,000 jobs that went with it.

Now, I’m very thankful, impressed and somewhat surprised that most of that money has been paid back. I am thankful that the men and women who work in those plants in Oshawa, or Oakville, or Windsor, or Brampton or the hundred other smaller little places around Ontario have those jobs, kept those jobs. That was probably a wise investment.

But when you ask me what kind of work is going to be done with \$20 million, I have to wonder. It’s not earmarked. It’s not targeting a specific industry or a particular location. It has no checks and balances. It is being taken from money that you’re robbing from other programs that you’re now shutting down, without announcing those in advance.

The reality is, here we have it; here we have this program. What are New Democrats going to do with this? I guess we’re going to allow it to go to second reading. We’re going to hear what people have to say about this. We’re going to have to listen to what small-town mayors in those particular parts of Ontario have to say. We’re going to have to look at where people think

that money might be allocated. We’re going to have to ask the bureaucrats and the minister tough questions about the apportionment of the money and where it’s coming from in the first place, because we believe that ordinary people have to have some hope in their lives. They have to think that something is going to get better. They have to think that maybe, but just maybe, there is a government program or some members of the Legislature who care more about them than about the 1%, who care more about them than the people who have pockets bulging full of money, more about them than the guys who can stand and come to committee and convince this government for the last eight years that all that has to happen is “Give us more tax cuts, and everything will be rosy.” Well, you gave them all of those tax cuts, you did all of those things, and things are not rosy.

All of you have constituency offices. All of you must have people who come in to see you; people who are begging for a chance to get a job; people who are begging for a chance to find decent housing; people who want governments to do things for them.

Well, this government chose, instead, to do the easy thing, to say, “We’re going to ask our friend Mr. Don Drummond”—who I would say is a very smart man, no umbrage on him, but you tied his hands. You asked him for a report telling the people of Ontario how to make \$16 billion in cuts, and you particularly forbade him from telling you where you could find additional revenue. Why did you not want to know that? Why do you not want to know where to find additional revenue? Why do you think it’s only the cuts? Why do you think ordinary people have to live in despair? Why is it you think that we can suffer some of our social programs and those things upon which people rely to be lost?

Heaven forbid we enter the days of Walkerton again; heaven forbid we have clashes in our schools; heaven forbid that people are locked out of hospitals and health care that they need.

It’s time for us to start thinking about those people, and not about the rich. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Joe Dickson:** After having seen the great students of Pine Ridge Secondary School here on their “i AM WHO i AM” program and delegation, I’m pleased to speak on Bill 11, the Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act, 2012.

The new southwestern Ontario development fund will help us address regional economic challenges facing southwestern Ontario—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Excuse me; I think you want to wait until your turn in rotation. This is just questions and comments.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** He is; he’s responding.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Okay, sorry.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Give him more time, Speaker. We want to hear.

*Interjections.*

**Mr. Joe Dickson:** I could start over at the beginning, because I know a lot of my friends across the aisle would—

**Mr. Paul Miller:** No, no.

**Mr. Joe Dickson:** Okay; I'll commence where I left off, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

We recognize the value and uniqueness of southwestern regional economic development. We're committed to working with our regional partners in southwestern Ontario, particularly to build strengths, generate new economic opportunities and attract the jobs of tomorrow. We will be consulting with business leaders and stakeholders, and they will help us design a program that may take the needs of the region into consideration.

We were very successful in eastern Ontario with this development program, with over 11,700 jobs. I know the previous member, Lou Rinaldi, for Northumberland-Quinte West worked hard on that, and the new member, Rob Milligan, I know will continue this good work.

Just a couple of quotes, Madam Speaker. I have a quote from a former federal MP and minister and the current mayor of London, Ontario, Mayor Joe Fontana: "Ontario's southwestern economy needs a shot in the arm and the proposed southwestern Ontario development fund is just the way to do it." Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** I would just remind all members that they are to, in the responses, consider the remarks of the previous speaker in their consideration.

The member for Haliburton-Kawartha Lakes-Brock.

**Ms. Laurie Scott:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to respond to the member from Beaches-East York's comments. He's also the finance critic for the third party, and he brought up some good comments in respect to Bill 11 here, which is the Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act.

Unfortunately, the Liberals have politicized and, actually, I think, jeopardized the eastern Ontario fund by bringing in this bill. We did have a fund. It has money in it. It has money, actually, left over in it, which we have asked questions—and I know the member from Beaches-East York has brought up the accountability problems within this bill, Bill 11, that we are bringing forward. I know that our critic who has led this bill—we're very, very happy to have him in the Legislature; the member for Lambton-Kent-Middlesex—has put order paper questions in.

With respect to accountability on this fund—I'm part of eastern Ontario, in Haliburton-Kawartha Lakes-Brock. I certainly want to attract more jobs; I need more jobs in the riding and I'm fighting to attract more jobs to the riding. So we had a fund, the eastern Ontario fund. It was working well, we've heard. We've all been, I think, at ROMA, at the Rural Ontario Municipal Association, and the Good Roads convention. We've been back and forth with our municipalities. They would like to see some changes to the eastern Ontario fund. We were

pretty firm in telling them that the government has politicized and jeopardized the eastern Ontario fund by bringing it into a piece of legislation adding in southwestern Ontario. Those are real concerns.

So when they say they'd like some changes to better fit the needs of being able to tap into the eastern Ontario development fund, we're saying that this bill isn't specific enough to say what the changes are going to be. It's going to be buried in regulations. There's no structure to this bill, as the member from Beaches-East York has said.

So this bill is really not good for my riding of Haliburton-Kawartha Lakes-Brock. I would hope the government would have been more flexible with us, in listening to us, but—thank you, Madam Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Paul Miller:** I'd like to commend the member from Beaches-East York for a fine presentation. Certainly, being the former mayor of East York, he knows his finances.

1630

Speaker, I see we have an eastern Ontario fund, which has done a lot for the community out there, and now the government wants to create one in southwestern Ontario because it has been hard hit. I would like to remind the government that the two hardest-hit areas in this province were Hamilton, Niagara and Welland and southwestern Ontario, so I'll just be looking forward to when they start the Hamilton-Niagara fund. We certainly could use it. We've lost more jobs than anyone else in Ontario.

A case could be made also that there should be across-the-board legislation requiring accountability in all business subsidy programs. Minnesota's clawback law is a good example of best practice in this area. The law requires that subsidy recipients sign formal subsidy agreements, which must include clawback language enabling the state—or province, if you want to—to recapture all or part of a subsidy, with interest, if a company does not fulfill the terms of the contract. The legislation requires that every subsidy program contain minimum requirements, including wage standards, and subsidy recipients must commit to wage and job goals. Companies that fail to meet their commitments are barred from receiving further subsidies in the state—and it could be "province"—for five years until they have repaid what they owe.

This is something that has had a lot of thought behind it. It's been successful in Minnesota, and other states are looking at it. The problem with the programs in this province is that they hand it out with no requirements, and no commitments from the recipients of these funds, other than maybe for political reasons.

If we want to really get our books in order, if we really want to change the large deficit we have, we have to consider having these companies commit to their communities for a period of time: commit to jobs, commit to the equipment that is bought and sold in Ontario instead

of bringing it in. That's when you'll start making success stories.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Thanks very much, Madam Speaker. I did listen to the remarks this afternoon from the member from Beaches–East York, and indeed the finance critic for the third party.

It's interesting to note that the eastern Ontario development fund and the idea that we need to enshrine this legislation was an idea from the eastern Ontario wardens' conference, and the past chair of that conference was actually the warden from Peterborough county, Mr. J. Murray Jones, who I had the opportunity to chat with yesterday. And why they wanted the eastern Ontario development fund enshrined in legislation is that they went through the experience before, when the old Eastern Ontario Development Corp. was eliminated, just by the stroke of a pen, through regulation, and they wanted to make sure that that never happened again. So indeed, by having the legislation here to support the southwestern development fund and indeed the eastern Ontario development fund, if that fund was to change, then the legislation would have to come back to the House to be amended, and there would be a full debate from all parties of the House to look at the future of the eastern Ontario development fund.

So make no mistake, it didn't come from government MPPs or opposition MPPs; this was the idea of the Eastern Ontario Wardens' Caucus, to ask that this be enshrined. And if you were down at ROMA/OGRA yesterday, they reiterated that position: They want to see this bill enshrined. They're the ones that have been driving this, and this is why they've been driving this initiative.

The other thing to note is that a recent study came out by Luc Vallée, who is an economist with the—let me check it here—Canadian economic development corporation, talking about the greatest pressure on Canadian manufacturing in Ontario and Quebec: the rapid appreciation of the Canadian dollar from 63 cents in 2001 to today where it's beyond parity—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. The member for Beaches–East York has two minutes to respond.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I thank the member from Ajax–Pickering, the member from Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock, the member from Hamilton East–Stoney Creek and the member from Peterborough. All of them had interesting things to say.

I thank the member from Ajax–Pickering for assuring us that the government intends to send this to committee and listen to stakeholders, because I think it's absolutely essential that the stakeholders tell us how they want this new corporation to be run, how this new money is going to be given out and that it just cannot be given out in the way that so many grants are given out by governments—without any kinds of strings attached, particularly

without weighing the pros and cons of everybody who is applying for it.

For the member from Haliburton–Kawartha Lakes–Brock, you're absolutely right: There are accountability problems inherent in this bill.

My colleague from Hamilton East–Stoney Creek talked about the experiment or the legislation in Minnesota, and gave some detail as to how it works. Really, it is tough legislation, because if people in business want to get government grants or loans or guarantees, then they have to come with the proviso that if they do not deliver, just like any contract, there are penalties involved. It cannot be, "Take my money and run away and I'll turn a blind eye," anymore. People are sick of seeing their tax dollars wasted. They expect something in return, and that something is good jobs.

The member from Peterborough talked about the wardens' conference. Yes, I heard from the wardens' conference myself, attending the AMO and ROMA conferences over the last number of years as the municipal affairs critic. I used to have six hats; now I only have two. But I heard those same things. They are very good ideas, and it needs to be enshrined in the legislation. But having said that, it needs to be done correctly.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** Thank you, Speaker. I'll be sharing my time with the member from Mississauga East–Cooksville.

I'm very pleased to speak to this bill. I think it's an important one, An Act respecting the continuation and establishment of development funds in order to promote regional economic development in eastern and southwestern Ontario, from the Honourable Brad Duguid, Minister of Economic Development and Innovation.

I made my living for 35 years in the counties of Prescott and Russell and of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry and other areas of eastern Ontario. I know, over those 35 years, how hard the small businesses worked to manage.

I think the history of these small villages and small towns, and certainly the history of those small developments in Renfrew county, as well—the ability to move their firms from the level of sort of subsistence to the next level where they have the modern technology and have the modern equipment is often a very difficult decision for them. They're making a living; they are doing well. It's always a difficult decision to make, to make that investment, to put those dollars out and jeopardize the future of their corporations. Being in business, that's what it is: You're always dealing with risks.

Ottawa–Orléans was not included in the original eastern Ontario economic development fund. I think that it should be, but it wasn't in there. But I do know what was happening, and I was at two openings where about 15% of the expansion dollars, the dollars invested in new

technology and new equipment—I was at two openings of that, and it expanded the ability.

In one case, they were making hydraulic turbines and they were selling mostly—this was just west of Ottawa. They were selling mostly to California and New York. I think those were the two areas. But with the new equipment that they were getting, the new investment they were making, the new technology they were buying, they were going to be able to service a lot of—I think they also had contracts in Spain. And so with a lot of the new water generation coming up, they were looking to expand the size of the hydraulic generators they could make. I was just impressed that they had gone to their banks, they'd gone to the governments, they had put it together, and our investment in that was around 15%. They were able to move that up. They were able to hire 10 or 15 new people; they were able to make the existing staff they had more secure.

I think it's extremely important to have this assistance. It's easy to say, as the member from the third party has said, that we want to make sure that we have all of these criteria in place so that if they aren't a success, then they have to pay the money back. But I think that that is not the way we've leveraged our money. It's not a major part of the overall investment.

1640

Most of them have been successful. The two that I went to just to see the new facilities, they were both successful. What I've heard in eastern Ontario from Jean-Marc Lalonde and from Jim Brownell before is that these were projects that were excellent projects for the communities and helped them move into a more competitive position and keep their people. So it's not as if it was 50% of the dollars that we were putting in. It was a small amount of money in comparison to the overall dollars. I think the \$20 million over three years leveraged \$485 million in investment across eastern Ontario and helped to create and protect over 11,700 jobs. Anything I have heard about this program showed that it was a very successful program, that it met the needs in these small towns and villages that get forgotten when you look at a big province like Ontario.

I was at the suite for the United Counties of Prescott and Russell and Glengarry last night, and it was good to see these mayors and councillors very active, up here for the Good Roads and the ROMA conference, and really working hard to do the best they could for their own small villages, small towns and small communities. They were working very hard at it, and they knew that this program was important to them. That's where it came from: The wardens wanted this program. They got this program for eastern Ontario, and it has been a successful program.

I know that I've heard a lot of complaints: that it takes a long time, that it's hard to get the dollars. But the projects that were supported were excellent projects. They were going to keep the people working. They were going to permit the growth that was needed to get into the

new markets and expand their production and their workforce.

This proposal for an additional area, southwestern Ontario, is supported by the Southwest Economic Alliance, the Western Wardens' Caucus, South Central Ontario Region and many more.

I think we have to look at what has happened to some of the communities like St. Thomas, Chatham, Windsor, Guelph and Stratford. They've had major impacts from the high Canadian dollar and the very low labour costs offshore. Trying to keep manufacturing and some businesses going is very important, and even though this isn't a great deal of dollars, we'll find that they're important dollars to those communities and we can get them going.

In the case of Ottawa-Orléans, we've just had 10,000 federal jobs transferred from central Ottawa, where they're 20 minutes away for our 100,000 people. They're now going to be over an hour away by bus and more than an hour away by car, out in Kanata. That was a decision that was made by the city of Ottawa—with OCRI and with all of the western power we have in Ottawa—and the federal Conservatives took those jobs. Ten thousand jobs: That's going to really hurt us in Ottawa-Orléans. That's going to really hurt Clarence-Rockland, Wendover and Hawkesbury, because those were the people that filled those federal jobs, that commuted to Ottawa every day. I think we might have 4,000 or 5,000 jobs lost in Ottawa-Orléans, 1,500 jobs lost in Clarence-Rockland, and so down the line, a major impact on Ottawa. I'm hoping that Ottawa-Orléans is in the new area for eastern Ontario, and I think it should be.

These are good programs. They're excellent programs for Ontario, and if we're going to make them too rigid and we're going to have to get guarantees for about 15% of the dollars, I'm not sure how that will work out. I know that the Ministry of Economic Development and Innovation who set up the controls on these projects were very stringent, were very tough on the applicants, were looking to make sure that any project that was approved was approved after careful consideration. They were all judged on the basis of which project is the best to maintain the existing jobs and to create new jobs in the future.

My experience in the smaller municipalities—and I don't think western Ontario is much different than eastern Ontario in that way—they need that support from government.

It's not as if it were dollars that we're paying for 50%, 60%, 70%. We leveraged those dollars. The \$485-million investment in eastern Ontario—I think that was four years, so maybe that was \$70 million or \$80 million of ours, so we're within the 15% to 20% range on those investments. We've created jobs.

Jean-Marc Lalonde and Jim Brownell told me often how important it was for their communities. They worked very hard, because Hawkesbury has always been an area that has struggled with very high unemployment. Clarence-Rockland had the benefit of employment with the federal government, in the national capital region. It's

a little bit better. But in most cases, high unemployment exists in eastern Ontario; it has for a long time.

With the major changes in the world economies, the major change in manufacturing in Ontario, we have had significant losses of manufacturing jobs, as everyone knows in southwestern Ontario. So moving part of that program into southwestern Ontario, using the same criteria which have been successful—this is important work for us to do, and I very much support what we're doing.

We have to look at not only the big companies; I think a lot of the jobs—and I think this is what the small business groups say—are created by small business. We have to come in and help them. We have to do our part so that they can help build our economy and help keep us going.

The importance of this fund to the smaller communities: Technology moves very quickly, and I think, the projects I saw, that's the area that we were concentrating on, in technology and on equipment upgrades.

We must support the areas outside of our major cities. We must support those areas. They're suffering a great deal more. This program will certainly help us to get there.

On the basis of the experience over three or four years—I sat in on many of the meetings with the eastern caucus members. I heard a lot about the program. I saw two of them that were successes just west of Ottawa, one for the hydraulic turbines, the other for casting, a casting plant. I think that we have a success here. Because of what's happened in the last three or four years with southwestern Ontario, they deserve the same treatment.

This will pay off in keeping jobs and building jobs and helping us to get through a situation that is not made in Ontario. Everyone knows this is not made in Ontario. Compared to most world economies, Ontario is doing very well. The HST has made our companies much more competitive.

I think that you should support this program in other parts of Ontario. I hope you do when it comes up for a vote. Thank you very much, Speaker, and I'll turn this over to—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for Mississauga East—Cooksville.

**Ms. Dipika Damerla:** It gives me much pleasure to speak to this bill, and I'd like to thank everybody else who participated in this debate.

I'd like to begin by saying that it boggles my mind that, on the one hand, the opposition keeps talking about a jobs crisis, but when this government comes out with a credible plan to create jobs, all they can do is criticize. In fact, I feel you guys are speaking out of both sides of your mouths because I know that the member from Leeds—Grenville, for instance, is very interested in tapping into the EODF.

As to the charge that we are politicizing the EODF, I have to say that I think it's the PC caucus that is doing it by pitting the west of Ontario against eastern Ontario.

We are not politicizing it at all; we are trying to be fair to any area that needs the help.

I also want to say that I think this government does know a thing or two about attracting foreign direct investment. It's not an accident that Ontario is the second-leading jurisdiction, just after California, to attract foreign investment, which means that this government knows what it's doing. But it's all about attracting investments and creating jobs. We have a track record to prove it.

**1650**

As to the charge that we are giving money without enough controls, that's not true. I have worked at the Ministry of Economic Development. I have personally worked on these funds, and I know that every time we give money out, it is with strict covenants and clawback requirements. That is already there, including job creation targets. So it is not true that we give taxpayer money out without—

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** Responsible and well administered.

**Ms. Dipika Damerla:** Exactly. As my colleague here is saying, we are very responsible in the way we administer these funds.

It's one thing to criticize the bill. We, on this side, are willing to work with concrete suggestions that talk about how we can make this bill better, but it's quite another thing to completely toss it out and say that it's a waste of taxpayer money. So if you have concrete suggestions as to how we can make this bill better, we are happy to hear that. But you can't just say, "This doesn't work." You cannot speak out of both sides of your mouth and on the one hand say, "There's a jobs crisis in Ontario," but not come up with any constructive advice as to how we can create jobs. How can you talk about subsidizing the horse racing industry but at the same time say that EODF or giving money to industry to create jobs is wrong? I just don't understand how you can speak out of both sides of your mouth at the same time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I'm pleased to respond to the member from Ottawa—Orléans and also the newly elected member from Mississauga East—Cooksville.

I'm going to concentrate on the member for Mississauga East—Cooksville for the moment—not to pick on her, but she made these comments over and over again. She talked about speaking out of both sides of their mouths.

You talk about the pot calling the kettle black. Today, the Minister of Economic Development was waxing on about how they're reviewing over \$2.3 billion of business economic aid and grants because they don't know if they work or not. So here are the two sides of the mouth: You've got \$2.3 billion; here you've got \$160 million.

But let's talk a little bit more about two sides of the mouth. When they promised, in the eastern Ontario development fund, that there would be \$80 million over four years—not quite so. Not so fast, Speaker. They shut

it down when there was \$23 million left and said that they never actually said they'd give \$80 million over four years—another broken McGuinty promise.

I'll tell you one thing. I will say to the member from Mississauga East—Cooksville: The one thing about Dalton McGuinty is, he can break a promise speaking out of either side of his mouth. There's no problem. Left or right, it makes no difference. If he makes a promise, you can rest assured it will be broken.

This is the problem right over here with this government: They are trying to pit the eastern Ontario fund, which has been successful, against western Ontario. They're trying to rob from the eastern Ontario fund to try to set up the west.

I say to the member from Peterborough, who was going on about the Eastern Ontario Wardens' Caucus, asking for it to be permanently entrenched: They never, ever mentioned the western Ontario fund. They wanted this eastern Ontario fund protected, and you people have gutted it for political reasons.

There's two sides of the mouth for you, Madam Speaker, right over there. They are duplicitous beyond belief.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** I'd ask the member to withdraw.

**Mr. John Yakubuski:** I withdraw.

**Mr. Paul Miller:** I'd like to address the member—

*Interjections.*

**Mr. Paul Miller:** The member from Ottawa—Orléans talked about small communities in eastern Ontario. Does the member really think there are no small communities around Hamilton? Let me give you a few: Dundas, Flamborough, Glanbrook, Mount Hope, Grassie, Grimsby, Stoney Creek, Binbrook, Copetown, Waterdown and Grimsby.

We have lots of areas in Hamilton that need help. We have one of the highest unemployment rates in the whole province. We've been hit the hardest, next to the Windsor area and southwestern Ontario. But I don't see a Hamilton-Niagara fund being created.

If you're going to rob from Peter to pay Paul, let's do it right. Let's spread it around a little. You've totally ignored Hamilton, Niagara, Welland. Approximately 57 companies have left. We've lost 22,000 jobs in the manufacturing sector. For some reason, this government thinks that Ontario ends in Burlington and the GTA. It doesn't, and it doesn't just go to southwestern Ontario and eastern Ontario. We had one of the strongest manufacturing bases at one time. We were one of the most productive places in Ontario, and we, once again, are getting left at the bus stop. We, again, are being ignored.

Naturally, the member from Orléans is going to stand up, because he's from eastern Ontario. That makes sense. You are doing your job for your community, but the other area you're going to work on is where you lost seats, in southwestern Ontario. Methinks it may be political. I'm not sure.

So I'd safely say that if you really want to look at who's getting hit hard, you might want to drive with me

through Hamilton and the area down there. We'll talk to all of the people who are sitting in the malls, in the Legions and other places because they can't get a job—thousands and thousands.

Have I heard this government once talk about Hamilton, a fund for Hamilton, Niagara and Welland? I haven't heard a word about it, so maybe we should start—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. Questions and comments.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I certainly enjoyed the remarks of the member from Ottawa—Orléans and the member from Mississauga East—Cooksville.

I was asked a question the other day: "Where can you find a copy of Changebook?" I'm told that they're all now on the bottom of the Niagara River because it was pitched under the bus pretty quickly.

But let me get back to the eastern Ontario development fund. This is a program that has been very successful in eastern Ontario. In my own community of Peterborough, 12 entities have been given support under the eastern Ontario development fund—everything from a multinational like Siemens, who produce the water and wastewater technology and machinery in Peterborough, through to McCloskey Brothers.

Interestingly enough, the Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honourable Stephen Harper, came to Peterborough airport to visit Flying Colours, which was the recipient of an eastern Ontario development fund grant. What did the Right Honourable Stephen Harper say that day? What a great organization and business; exactly the kind of thing that we need in manufacturing in Ontario.

What better support for this program than the Right Honourable Stephen Harper? I appreciate his support of the eastern Ontario development fund because he took the opportunity, first-hand, to see the success of the eastern Ontario development fund.

But it's going to be interesting in the weeks to come to see whether those members on the opposite side from eastern Ontario are going to be here to vote for this piece of legislation, or are they going to pull the Houdini act and disappear for that afternoon when that vote will come up? We'll see exactly where they stand on the eastern Ontario development fund and the proposed southwestern development fund.

These are excellent programs. They'll be working on behalf of businesses, both in southwestern Ontario in the future and continuing to support businesses in eastern Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. Further comments and questions.

**Ms. Laurie Scott:** Again, I'm pleased to rise to speak on Bill 11, which is the Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act, 2012. Sometimes we interpret it as "Robbing the eastern Ontario economic development fund," which we keep trying to express.

I know the member from Peterborough has had some successes. I've had successes in Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brook. We don't disagree that the eastern Ontario economic development fund has been successful. They're

politicizing it by combining it with southwestern Ontario and making it into legislation. So when the member asks where the votes are going to be, he is actually admitting to the fact they have politicized this bill.

This isn't about helping people in Ontario. They've politicized it to try and wedge the opposition over here. That's not caring about the people in your ridings. You could be jeopardizing the people in eastern Ontario and in the riding of Haliburton-Kawartha Lakes-Brock by robbing it of the fund that exists now, the eastern Ontario fund. There are still order paper questions. We met with the minister last week to say, "Hey, where are the answers to the order paper questions that the member from Lambton-Kent-Middlesex has put in?"

We've all said, "Where's the framework?" The legislation tells you nothing. It tells you nothing. So how are we supposed to be responsible with government bills if you don't give us any information? Again, no questions from the order paper that were put forward. Time is ticking, and the minister said he'd get to them as quickly as possible; I don't think he has given us any answers. Again, a little shell game—it's shocking from the Liberals over there, just shocking from the Liberals.

I say to the people in eastern Ontario: Watch these guys. The Liberal government is playing a shell game. We're going to be the losers in eastern Ontario. We just need some changes to that fund. Leave it alone. There's money left over; where is that going?

1700

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member from Ottawa-Orléans has two minutes to respond.

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** I want to thank the member from Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke. He thought we should have kicked that \$23 million out the door. With an \$80-million project, it was \$57 million spent. There were very tight controls in those projects all through. I know that. I heard from the members who were applying for those projects, but it benefited many, many members across eastern Ontario.

We're not pitting southwestern Ontario against eastern Ontario in this. It's just that after the downturn with manufacturing, there certainly is a need in southwestern Ontario. So the same program, with the same principles, with the same good results, certainly, will be welcome for the people there.

To the member from Hamilton East-Stoney Creek: I'm sure that you have your needs in your municipality and in the Hamilton area, but this was a promise made during the campaign. It was the Southwest Economic Alliance, supported by the Western Ontario Wardens' Caucus, the South Central Ontario Region, the Southwestern Ontario Marketing Alliance. They called on the Ontario government to create a southwestern Ontario economic development fund in the lead up to the 2011 provincial election, and we included that in our election platform. There may be some work for you to do in your area in order to get the assistance you need for some small businesses that may be able to stabilize their employment and increase their employment with a little money.

I thank the member for Peterborough, who has been a staunch supporter of this and one of the people who got it going in eastern Ontario. He has done an excellent job. He has had some good successes in his area, I'm sure, and he knows how stringent the requirements were for this program but how many good companies got them.

To the member for Haliburton-Kawartha: This is a good program; it's a program that we need. Thank you, Speaker, for this opportunity to speak to it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Mr. Rick Nicholls:** I respect the comments made by the member opposite from Ottawa-Orléans regarding this bill, but I see it differently.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to thank my colleague from Lambton-Kent-Middlesex for his thoughtful, stern denunciation of yet another Liberal spend bill and for his continued work to fight for strong jobs for Ontario workers.

As a proud MPP for a southwestern Ontario riding, I consider it a great privilege to have this opportunity today to expose this bill as yet another prime example of this government's inability to cope with the fiscal crisis that they have created.

In just eight years, this Premier and his government have dug us a hole so deep even a list of the taxes they've introduced wouldn't reach the bottom. They only know one direction, and that's down. They keep digging, hoping against hope that somehow they'll emerge in an alternate reality where they haven't made a complete mess of Ontario's finances.

The old joke used to be that if you dug straight down you'd eventually end up in China. Well, science tells us that we'd actually end up somewhere else: in the Indian Ocean. It's almost as if this government wanted to find out for themselves, isn't it? They keep spending; they kept digging Ontario into a deeper pit, and now the province that we love is right where logic tells us it would be: under water. We joke because if we don't, we may cry.

Ontario has 600,000 people out of work—600,000. That would be like taking my home riding of Chatham-Kent-Essex and eliminating the job of every single person who lived there six times over.

That number is made up of 300,000 jobs lost in the manufacturing sector. That's 300,000 people with no way to put food on the table for their families, to put a little more money away for their child's education or to afford new hockey equipment. I'll say it again: 300,000 people out of work in one single industry, an industry that has a proud history in my riding. Because my colleagues opposite could not discern the difference between a need and a want, Ontario families are now struggling to afford their needs.

I invite the members opposite to come to Chatham-Kent-Essex riding. Come and talk to the families, the small businesses and the workers. I've spent a lot of time getting to know them in my 50-plus years of living there; I'll introduce them to you. Some of them were born and

raised there. Sometimes they come from other provinces; indeed, other countries. They work in health care, manufacturing and construction. Some worked a night job while going to school to pay for their university education. Some made it out of high school and, through sheer determination, started a business that has sustained generations of their families. They come from different walks of life, Madam Speaker, but I can tell you one thing they all have in common: Every single one of them could look the members opposite in the eye and tell them the difference between a need and a want.

There's another gentleman that has tried mightily to tell the Liberals the basic lesson. This lesson is something that my own children even understood before they were three years of age. That man is Don Drummond. The members opposite are looking in every possible direction, but don't let that fool you: They know who he is. That's because they chose him themselves.

Mr. Drummond took on the daunting task of cleaning up this government's crippling mess, of making the tough recommendations to pull Ontario back from the brink. Over 360 recommendations were made, Madam Speaker. These recommendations overwhelmingly indicate that Ontario needs a desperate change and we need it quickly.

Yet, here we are today. We're facing, as my colleague so grimly pointed out last week, a \$411-billion debt. It's waiting there at the end of the road, and this is where this government is merrily leading us down, without a thought or a care to where it might be headed. Even after the Drummond report clearly stated in no uncertain terms that any spending project must be balanced with equal or greater savings elsewhere, this government sits here discussing plans for a \$160-million gambit that will not create jobs; it will only succeed in further solidifying Ontario's future as Canada's equivalent to Greece.

It's as if they were leading us down this road on purpose, because they know their hold on government will be short-lived. It's as if they want to leave this government and the people of Ontario in a huge mess. It's as if they're thumbing their noses at us, saying, "You're the government now. You figure it out."

This is a slush fund, pure and simple, and it's not the first. This government was recently caught targeting Liberal ridings with their multi-million-dollar eastern Ontario development fund, which lavished 80% of its activity on Liberal-held ridings. Madam Speaker, why should families trust them again?

This smacks of the same desperation that has permeated this government for so long as they scramble for a solution to the problems they've created. It shows, without a shadow of a doubt, that they have not learned the lesson that was handed to them again by frustrated Ontarians in the last election. They couldn't be honest with them then about the trouble the province is in. They can't be honest now, when they say they're actually going to consider the options Don Drummond has given them. Instead, we get \$160 million more in spending without a single, solitary, reasonable cost-cutting measure to show for it.

1710

Here's a very short list of what they've brought to the table: \$20 billion in spending since the recession, \$2.5 billion in new spending since the election, and now \$160 million that will not create the jobs that Ontario so desperately needs.

My colleague from Lambton-Kent-Middlesex knows all too well the troubles that have afflicted the communities we share in southwestern Ontario. He outlined this government's inaction when Caterpillar shut down their London plant, how this Premier allowed those jobs to just pack up and leave town, and crush families as they did so, not to mention the feeder industries that were also affected. Shame.

My home riding has experienced its share of heart-break as well. While this government spent the province into oblivion, Chatham-Kent-Essex has lost over 10,000 jobs since 2003. It breaks my heart to list the companies that have had to shut their doors: Navistar, KS Centoco, Oxford Automotive, Fleetwood Metal, OES in Blenheim, Energy Automotive, Siemens VDO, ArvinMeritor, Daymond Aluminum, Southwest Regional Centre, Great Lakes Fish, Penske Logistics, and the list continues—150 businesses closed since 2003, Madam Speaker.

These jobs haven't disappeared because the workers in those communities gave up; they disappeared because Ontario is no longer the best place to run a business. That ugly reality affects more than just job numbers in the census; it affects families, moms and dads, friends and neighbours, people who thought they would always live in a land that would give them every opportunity to succeed if they worked hard enough. But then this Premier slapped them with a dog's breakfast of regulations and red tape, with skyrocketing hydro bills that crushed manufacturing and natural resource industries from Toronto to Timiskaming. That's been their only plan all along: more government meddling in place of the action that would actually staunch the lost jobs.

It's embarrassing. The members opposite won't look me in the eye, but they don't have to. They know that it's their fault, that they not only failed to act when the moment was upon them to do so, but that they made the situation worse by not being able to see the difference between what they wanted and what the province needed. It's shameful. It's a shameful state of affairs. It's going to take a lot of hard work to get this province back to a place that welcomes business once more, instead of hindering it.

Yet amidst these embarrassing realities, Madam Speaker, I can say that I am proud of a few things.

I'm proud, first and foremost, that my own children have grown up to understand the basic common sense this government lacks, that when you have run out of money, it's time to stop spending.

I'm proud of where I'm from, the beautiful communities of southern Ontario that never ask for government handouts, never shift the blame to where it doesn't belong, and never, ever give up, even though their own

government has. This government drops the ball again and again.

And I'm proud of the caucus with which I stand today, a group of people and leader that all saw the writing on the wall long before Mr. Drummond had come along to shake some sense into this Premier and his moth-eaten wallet.

If I may, now I'd like to point out for the members opposite exactly what I mean when I say that the writing is on the wall. We all remember, of course, the recent general election in Ontario that sharply rebuked the Premier's apparent mandate of spending every cent he could find. Ontario families sent him back with a message to get his act together, start making the tough decisions, and work with the other parties to get it done. Good advice, Madam Speaker. Ontarians saw that our party had long been serving up the ideas that would actually succeed in bringing businesses and jobs back to the places where they had once been lost.

And if that wasn't enough proof, Don Drummond, the Liberals' own hand-picked adviser, agreed with Ontarians too: There were better ideas out there than the Liberal mission to double the province's debt. Those ideas belonged to our party.

I'd like to quote from Drummond, if I may, on the subject of arbitration reform: "Ability to pay" criteria should be broadened to include economic and fiscal environment, and productivity criteria in arbitration awards/decisions." That's on page 373 of his report—a clear call, Madam Speaker, for the kind of arbitration overhaul that the PC Party has long called for, one that might make life a little uncomfortable for the Premier's union friends but will go a long way to reducing the public sector compensation that has been a fiscal albatross in Ontario for too long. Not only that, but it shows respect to municipalities that have struggled to make their communities work amongst the meddling of this government. These communities don't want slush funds disguised as handouts, Madam Speaker, despite what the government would have you believe by bringing this bill forward. They want a fair deal. Imagine that.

Ontarians agree; Mr. Drummond agrees; the PC Party agrees. The Liberal government looks the other way.

I quote again, Madam Speaker, from Drummond: "A significant opportunity exists for ServiceOntario to find new capital and expand services by leveraging private-sector investment and participation through competition"—page 389 in his report. If that sounds familiar to the members of the House, it should. Our party has long called for increased ability for the private sector to contribute to public life in Ontario through better competition. That way, we can draw upon the talent and expertise that Ontario has always been known for while simultaneously securing the best deal for Ontario families when it comes to government services.

Ontarians agree; Mr. Drummond agrees; the PC Party agrees. The Liberal government looks the other way.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I'd like to highlight one more recommendation that this government would do

well to heed. The government should "review existing agency mandates and functions" to ensure that every one of them is living up to their stated purpose. That's why we on this side of the House call for a top-to-bottom review of the more than 600—that's correct, 600—agencies, boards and commissions that were funded by or are currently receiving the tax dollars of hard-working Ontario families.

I'm careful not to call it "government" funding here, Madam Speaker, because I believe it's a misnomer. It's not government funding; it is tax dollars pulled from the pockets of every honest, hard-working Ontarian who thought that they were going to work so that they could feed their families, not pay for this Premier's pet projects and political posturing.

Ontarians agree; Mr. Drummond agrees; the PC Party agrees. This government looks the other way.

There's only so long we're going to be able to say, "It's not too late." There's only so much time left to turn Ontario around, Madam Speaker. Let's have this session of the Legislature be the "better late than never" session instead of the "too little, too late" session, because this government will never, ever be able to say that they weren't warned. They can no longer hide behind the flimsy excuse that they were taken by surprise by tough economic times. No, no, no; that time is gone. That excuse isn't worth the paper it's printed on.

Over the past months, while the Liberals waited for Don Drummond to fix their troubles, we saw an Auditor General's report that detailed in no uncertain terms the waste and mismanagement the members opposite perpetuated. That was a clear, non-partisan call for change in direction, and nothing happened. There was the inevitable downgrading from Moody's Investors Service that broadcast to the entire world just how bad things are in Ontario. The word Moody's chose was "negative." I would have chosen some harsher words than that, but out of respect for the House, I won't say them here. It was a moment that should have seen all the members opposite hang their heads in shame, and they should be doing that now as well.

1720

Finally, the Conference Board of Canada, a respected institution, had to hold this government's hand and explain, as I used to do with my children, that you'll never save money if you keep spending more than you have in your pocket.

Would you like to know the scariest thing about all this? This government really and truly believes that it is at the end of an economic success story of their own creation: 600,000 people out of work, 300,000 jobs lost in one industry; warning after warning after warning from industry experts, all desperately trying to tell them that they're wrong, wrong, wrong, and that things are not in fact getting better in Ontario; an election that spoke volumes about the frustration of Ontario families; a report from Don Drummond that warns of a \$411-billion debt, a number so insurmountable that it's difficult to comprehend.

Speaker, I stand today to oppose this bill wholeheartedly. I believe that Ontario families will as well, because frankly, nobody trusts this government with more spending. That's the last thing that we want to see. Families should be recoiling in horror every time this Premier opens up his wallet. More corporate welfare from this government? No. More handouts, slush funds and mismanaged tax dollars? No. More of the same failing strategy of deciding which businesses get to struggle along in a damaged Ontario and which ones are left to fend for themselves. I say no, our party says no, Don Drummond says no and Ontario families and workers say no.

It's time to create the conditions for success instead of putting an expensive Band-Aid on this government's failures. It's time to give Ontario businesses a much-needed hand up instead of a handout. Let's get energy bills under control. Let's eliminate crippling red tape that keeps businesses struggling to breathe instead of flourishing. Let's make Ontario the best place to start a business and keep it running, and let's start right here by telling this government: Sorry, but you can't spend your way out of this one.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** I'd like to draw attention, for all members, to the fact that we have in the members' gallery Ron Johnson, the former member for Brantford in the 36th Parliament. Welcome, Mr. Johnson.

We'll move to questions and comments.

**Miss Monique Taylor:** I am happy to add my voice to this discussion regarding attracting investments and creating jobs. It's my first thought, of course: The creating jobs act—what's not to like about it? After all, that's definitely what we should be talking about here in Queen's Park, but once again, my mind seems to come back to statements I've heard through previous bills that we've spoken about: that the title sounds better than what's actually inside the bill. So it's concerning to me.

In my riding of Hamilton Mountain, I know that what people are calling for is jobs. Again, as my colleague here—thank you, Mr. Miller—has brought forward, we're not talking about jobs in Hamilton; we're talking about jobs in other regions, which of course, we all need, so it's definitely concerning.

People want to work and they want to be part of a community. They want to be able to pay their fair share of taxes for services that we need in our governments, and we want to be able to be accountable to the people of Ontario. So we have to make sure that the money that we're investing in investments like this is being held accountable, that we do have strings attached and that we're not just giving money away without saying, "There is going to be a consequence if you don't use the money where it's deserved to be spent." These are the things that the people of Ontario are counting on us to do. Hopefully, when bills like this go to committee, we'll be able to make sure that we do get the wording in there that is going to be protecting our citizens.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for Oakville.

**Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** It's a pleasure to join the debate today. I represent the riding of Oakville, which isn't in southwestern Ontario, but I think as members of the House we do try to pay attention to what's happening in the other areas around the province. We learn from each other, we have a sensitivity to some of the problems that are being experienced in other areas and where the successes are as well. So it was interesting to listen to the remarks of the member from Chatham-Kent-Essex.

Let me tell you right from the start, even though I'm not from southwestern Ontario I will be supporting this bill, because it makes sense. It makes sense for the businesses and it makes sense for the communities in southwestern Ontario. The member from Chatham-Kent-Essex, who represents that area, certainly is free to make up his own mind as to whether he'll support the people in his community or the businesses, or will support the job creation that surely will flow from this investment.

**Interjection:** Free vote.

**Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** But as I said, it's a free vote in this House and certainly he can vote as he sees fit.

As a result of strategic initiatives in my own community, for example, I think of the Ford plant. There was a time when the auto industry was in trouble and the federal government and the provincial government stepped forward and made some strategic investments. What that allowed was for the Ford plant to move into flexible manufacturing. What that means is the Ford plant in Oakville has a very bright and rosy future—moving into the future, obviously—and that cars will continue to be there.

Now, he asked us to take advice from that party. This is the party where the graduation rates, when we took over, were in the 60s. Just over six out of 10 kids in our high schools were graduating; millions of days lost in school strikes; the longest wait times in the country when it came to hospital and health care; and they stand here today and try to lecture us on how we should run an economy. You should be ashamed of yourselves, the way you turned this province into a have-not province.

We've got it back on track. The way we've got it back on track is by investing in places like southern Ontario and southwestern Ontario. Step forward and support Ontario.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Comments and questions?

**Mr. Todd Smith:** Boy, the member from Oakville sure has his facts mixed up, because I believe when this government took over, we were the have province in Canada and now suddenly it is a have-not province after eight years under Dalton McGuinty's Liberal government.

I am standing here to respond, though, to my colleague the member from Chatham-Kent-Essex. He put out a lot of numbers during his 20 minutes while he was speaking there. There were a lot of numbers there: 600,000 jobs lost; a \$30-billion deficit is what we're headed for under this government; a \$411-billion debt.

I'm proud to stand here with the member for Chatham-Kent-Essex, because he represents his constituents extremely well and he will in the future, and that's why he's here.

There was a long list as well of companies that have gone out of business in Chatham-Kent-Essex over the last eight years. He listed them all. You heard them, surely. It was a long list, and I think he probably had more, but he only had 20 minutes' time to work with.

You know, it's time for this government to realize that they have dug an incredibly deep hole in the province of Ontario. They've run companies out of business. Companies are jumping over the border from Ontario to Quebec now, because they can get cheaper electricity prices—and I don't know if the member talked about electricity or not, but we know how much electricity is going up: the Auditor General said himself, 46% over the next couple of years in the province of Ontario because of a failed Green Energy Act here in Ontario. It's something that needs to be addressed right away, before we lose even more industry in the province of Ontario, and I know my friend the member from Chatham-Kent-Essex will stand up for the members in his riding and do the right thing, just as we will.

It's time for this government to stop playing political games with something that was working in eastern Ontario, the EODF, and stop playing their little political games with this fund.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for Beaches-East York.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I listened intently to the member from Chatham-Kent-Essex and what he had to say. And you know, I often have an opportunity to travel in southwestern Ontario and around the Chatham region, and one can only despair—I hope the people there don't despair, but I despair in my own soul, my own heart, for a few minutes when I go into Chatham and I see the number of businesses that have been closed; when I see the downtown core not as vibrant as it once was. It is a very pretty little town and I would invite all the members, if you've not been there, to go and have a look.

But this is the same thing: He is feeling for the people of his town, the people of his region and what they are suffering. They are starting to lose hope. I don't know whether this program the government's proposing is going to give them some hope. I can only say in my own heart that anything that is done that gives people some kind of hope for the future is the right thing.

1730

I don't know how he's going to vote either, but I was really impressed when he brought out the whole issue of corporate welfare. It took me back to my youth. It took me back to that marvellous campaign when David Lewis was the leader of the federal NDP and he ran the whole campaign on corporate welfare bums. He was talking about all of those corporations that take all of the government grants and don't pay anything in taxes. I remember, in those days, who they were. They were the

big banks, the insurance companies, and the multinational oil companies. Those were the guys who took all of the money and paid nothing. Well, 40 years later, you have a Conservative raising the same issues, but the same thing is still in effect. You've got the big banks, the insurance companies and the gas and oil companies taking millions of dollars, getting all the government grants. If there was ever an issue of corporate welfare bums, it's here still.

God bless David Lewis, and thank you to the Conservative for raising this issue 40 years later.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for Chatham-Kent-Essex has two minutes to respond.

**Mr. Rick Nicholls:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to thank the members from Hamilton Mountain, Oakville, Prince Edward-Hastings and Beaches-East York for their enlightening comments and their honesty.

Madam Speaker, I believe this: that a good idea doesn't care who owns it. I look at this bill—in my heart of hearts, am I for job creation? The answer is definitely: Yes, I am. In my area, as I pointed out in my talk earlier, we've lost over 10,000 jobs since 2003. Coincidentally, I believe that's when this government took office. However, having said that, we look at the monies that they have given away in the eastern economic development fund—not so certain that all that money has been accounted for. I do have some concerns, not so much where that money went—we know that about 80% of it went to Liberal-friendly ridings—but it's what happened to those businesses that, in fact, were given that money to grow, to develop, to flourish under their plan—I give them credit for that—some of which are not around today. So I have a concern about that.

I believe that there needs to be greater accountability. Job loss, job creation—and I talked earlier about corporate welfare. That's not the way to do it. So, let's free up business to create and innovate. Let's get rid of the red tape. Let's clean up government-funded agencies, boards and commissions to improve their efficiencies. If they're not working, get rid of them. If it's workable, clean it up. If they're working fine, leave them alone.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate? The member for Toronto-Danforth.

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** Thank you, Speaker. I've been around here for a few years—not as many as Mr. Bradley here, who I think was here when the glaciers first receded and grass first re-established itself in this region. I don't say that as a bad thing. I recognize those who have experience and bring that long-term wisdom to the table. I've picked up a few things in my time, Madam Speaker, and generally I find that the longer the title of the bill, the less there is in it.

This is An Act respecting the continuation and establishment of development funds in order to promote regional economic development in eastern and southwestern Ontario. As I read those words, you can feel the content of the bill shrink and shrink and shrink, because

you have to have a big title to cover this kind of small property—empty, thin.

The explanatory note—this is the good stuff: “The bill requires the Minister of Economic Development and Innovation to continue the eastern Ontario development fund”—we need a bill to continue that fund; I know that you, Speaker, are shocked, but that activity was in danger and may well be saved by this bill; my goodness—“and to establish and continue the southwestern Ontario development fund to promote regional economic development in eastern Ontario and southwestern Ontario. The minister is to conduct a review of the effectiveness of these programs by the fifth anniversary of their continuation and establishment.”

Now, I have to tell you, the rest of the bill isn't much longer than what I've just read out.

So for those of you in southwestern Ontario, those in London, Ingersoll, Woodstock and Chatham-Kent-Essex, those who are today looking for a job, hoping to be able to establish their lives, pay their rent, pay their mortgages, get in groceries, those who want to send their children to college or university, keep them in high school instead of yanking them out and seeing if they can find a job themselves, I have to say, do not place all your bets on this bill.

Is this bill wrong? Not necessarily. Investing in local economic development can be a good thing. But is it weak? Absolutely, absolutely. This is not sliced bread. This is not the second coming of Mr. Ford—and I mean the original industrialist and car manufacturer. This is much thinner stuff.

This bill comes before us really as an empty vessel for the transfer of funds. There was no program brought forward, no strategy that was introduced. I've seen too many of these bills. Just before the last election, we had another water bill introduced by this government. I know there's an election coming because a bill is introduced to save water in Ontario: had it before 2007; had it before 2011. I remember going through the debate on that bill—Mr. Prue was here—and I kept saying, “I see the bill, but what's the plan?” You know, I look at California and they bring in these water bills. They actually have targets; they have ideas of what needs to be done. They talk about the larger plan. We didn't get any plan. What we got was a very long title with a very small bill.

Speaker, when you look at this—and my colleague from London-Fanshawe had this to say and my colleague from Hamilton Mountain—I don't see anything in here about jobs having to be guaranteed by those who receive the funds. Nope. So you can give out the cash, but will you actually hold the jobs here?

**Mr. Paul Miller:** Or recover the cash?

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** Good question. When I look at the background on this—and my colleague from Beaches-East York talked about this—funds are being reallocated from other job creation programs: robbing from Peter to pay Paul. I've been particularly offended by that slogan throughout my life. Mr. Hamilton East here has always been very happy with it. But that's what

we have. We're shuffling the shells, looking for where that quarter is going to wind up, and it's been moved. It has been moved from one shell to another shell.

Spending money on job creation is not a bad thing, but I have to say—I understand the amount of funds that are going to be allocated here, about 20 million bucks—it's more money than I ever hope to see in my life. But there are about, what, 300,000 people living in London? Let's say, three people to a home, about 100,000 homes. This is the equivalent of the purchase and sale of about 100 homes every year in London, so we're talking about a very small wave in a very big ocean.

There are millions of people throughout southwestern Ontario facing a very ugly situation. Southwestern Ontario has gotten the stuffing kicked out of it in the last eight, nine years.

**Mr. Paul Miller:** How about Hamilton-Niagara? Wow.

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** Not to mention Hamilton-Niagara, but they're not included in this bill.

The economic impact of buying or selling 100 houses in London is pretty small compared to the scale of the problem before us. Again, not nothing, but very, very thin comfort for those who were trying to pull their lives together, for those who want to have some confidence for their future.

1740

Think about what's working against those people. Think about what this government has done that is undermining their economic future. Just the other day, I talked about the report from the SEACOR Group about the \$1.5 billion a year that's being taken out of our economy because this government overbuilt on gas-fired power plants, overbuilt on nuclear power plants. That money that could have been used to build the economy in southwestern Ontario instead is going off to profit companies in Texas and Alberta.

Madam Speaker, about a year ago, the Toronto Star reported that when electricity companies in Ontario export power out of the province, that power is subsidized to the tune of \$200 million a year for five years—a billion bucks. This \$20 million gets lost in those kinds of numbers, but those have a huge impact on us.

Let's talk about the ongoing and other big drain on the economy of Ontario, and that's the ongoing corporate tax cuts that undermine our public services. If you need transit or if you need good roads going through your city, the \$2 billion a year that are given in corporate tax cuts mean that your infrastructure is not well maintained; that skilled engineers, skilled construction workers, skilled accountants don't have the opportunity to put in place the infrastructure that we need.

Our education system: stretched. Talk to any teacher in this province; talk to students in this province. They can tell you how that undermining of provincial finances through those corporate tax cuts is undermining our ability to educate the next generation to actually build the workforce that Ontario needs.

Our overburdened cities, our municipalities: coping with, grappling with, downloading that came during the period of Mike Harris, and not corrected by this government.

I had the opportunity in the previous Parliament to sit as the finance critic. My colleague Mr. Prue can speak about his experiences with it. One of my opportunities was to actually sit down with the Minister of Revenue at the time, Mr. Wilkinson, and go through the impact of the HST on Ontario's economy and on working people in this province. You have to know, Speaker, that the HST was this huge tax shift—a shift of the burden of taxes from corporations, that were doing very well, to individuals, the great mass, the public of Ontario, who have to carry that big load.

About half of the \$5 billion in reduced tax payments by companies went to the construction sector. Did that get passed on to those who bought homes or condominiums? Did people see big cuts in the cost of houses or condos? No, Madam Speaker. Those savings went into the hands of those who were getting the cuts. They didn't go back into our economy; they went into the mammoth pools of cash that are being held by huge companies throughout this province and pools of cash held by companies outside of this province. When we look around at everyday people and their ability to buy goods and services, to pay tuition, to put clothes on their backs, to buy those homes that I talked about—their ability to buy and thus our economy's ability to grow and to function has been grossly undermined.

Madam Speaker, in the course of the pre-budget hearings last year, I had the opportunity to sit through a variety of presentations. One presentation showed the impact in Canada, over the last decade, of corporate tax cuts. I have to tell you that that strategy, which has been central to this Liberal government, encouraged by the official opposition, has not given us what we needed. In fact, if you look at the statistics, every year, as corporate taxes were cut, corporate investment in Ontario has dropped. That's the reality. That's the reality; that's why that strategy is a failure.

If you take the opportunity—you can go to the legislative library; you don't have to walk far. One of these pages—very capable pages—can go to that library and get the book *A Governor's Story*, written by Jennifer Granholm. I urge all of you to take the opportunity to read that book. Jennifer Granholm was the governor of Michigan earlier in the last decade, and she writes about her experience coming into power in a state which had been subjected to an ongoing tax cut agenda. So when she came into power the cupboard was bare, and as she came into power the economy of Michigan, based on car manufacturing, started to falter. Her strategy, Speaker? Her strategy was to cut taxes wherever she could in Michigan. And you know the bitter thing she learned? The very bitter thing she learned is that it didn't create any jobs in her state.

Yes, she slashed social services; yes, she cut investment; yes, towns, municipalities and rural areas faced

hard times; but even when she offered deep-discount rates to corporations, they said, "I can still do better in Mexico. Forget about your tax cuts."

She did note, however, that Ontario's public health system did offer a cost savings to auto manufacturers that she couldn't match in privatized-health-care Michigan. So health care cuts for us don't help us. Tax cuts for corporations don't help us. Tax cuts for Michigan didn't help Michigan. Jennifer Granholm went through it, did it and has a lesson that we all need to learn from.

This bill has got to also be understood in the context of this Liberal government's record. Even before 2008 and the crash then—and my colleague Michael Prue, who was here, and all of you who were in the province at that time know that we lost hundreds of thousands of good jobs prior to the crash. We were yelling about it in 2007, during that election. Before the 2008 Wall Street crash, this province was losing jobs, and since then we have continued to lose them and we have converted good jobs. We—the policies of this government—have allowed good, family-supporting, career-developing jobs to decay so that more and more people are trying to survive on less and less.

It's no surprise that, with the loss of jobs and conversion to lower-skill, lower-paid employment, average hourly wages in Ontario, when you take into account inflation, are the same as they were in 1991. Two decades and stagnation in the standard of living—stagnation.

Speaker, this bill may not be evil, this bill may not move things backwards, but this bill is so small and so weak, compared to the task before us. This bill is put forward in the context of no real economic development plan on the part of the government. This bill is put forward without even an independent board to allocate its funds to insulate these monies from political interference or gaming. This bill has no guarantees for jobs and does not speak about even giving the province of Ontario the ability to claw back from corporations when they don't actually hold to their promises. My colleague here from London—Fanshawe spoke about the experience with Caterpillar, the money that was given by the federal government, the jobs that were lost when that company, Caterpillar, took that money and, really, with very little thought, very little hesitation and certainly no remorse, decided to move the jobs out of Ontario.

1750

Speaker, one would have thought that this government would have learned from Stephen Harper's mistakes. One would be wrong. One would have thought that this government would have looked to its federal party's comments on federal corporate tax cuts. One would be wrong.

This government is bringing forward this bill to do its best to look good to the people of southwestern Ontario. But in terms of actually making a difference to the lives of the men and the women who are living there, I don't have a lot of confidence that it will make that change.

Speaker, I look forward to the comments of my colleagues and I hope that, at some point in this chamber,

we will talk about economic development strategies and plans that will make a difference to people's lives.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Questions and comments?

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** I always enjoy the member when he speaks in the House, particularly on a bill of this kind. I detected that there was some support for this particular piece of legislation. I want to commend his party on that.

I would recommend to him a book that I just obtained from the library. I had it last time. I had it out so long, they had to send a posse to get it from me—and then they didn't charge me any fine, which was nice. But I went up to the library while the member was speaking, his words echoing in my ears, and got the book. It's called *Minding the Public Purse*, by Janice MacKinnon, who was the NDP Minister of Finance in Saskatchewan in the 1990s, when they were struggling with a deficit situation in that province. It's very instructive, particularly for New Democrats, because she had to go through a very, very challenging and difficult time with her own colleagues recognizing the circumstances that arose, and not all of the things that government would like to do, they could do. This was a period of time in which the NDP unfortunately closed 52 rural hospitals in Saskatchewan—not because they were mean, not because they were callous people, but because they recognized at that time that that was one of the things that had to be done to solve their problems.

I want to say to the member that I was in St. Catharines for a consultation on this bill. He said that it's not very thick and it doesn't have details, but indeed we were speaking to the local community to ask, "What do you think should be the framework of this bill?" because we like consulting on these matters.

The chamber of commerce was there with rounds of applause. The local business development department of the city of St. Catharines, the region of Niagara and others—the business development community was there, and they were looking forward with anticipation to this bill passing in the Legislature. I said I would convey to all of my colleagues in the House the desire to see it passed. They've loved this in eastern Ontario. My friend Norm Sterling was a great fan of it, as was Senator Runciman, recently appointed to the Senate by Mr. Harper, the Prime Minister of Canada. So this is—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments or questions?

**Mr. Jim McDonnell:** It's interesting that I hear the comments from our member from Toronto–Danforth, and I agree that this government has no plan. We look at the Drummond report where it talks about cutting spending by 17%, and the 362 recommendations: We're waiting to hear where they're going with it with the budget fast approaching. We were hoping to see some committees so that we would go around the province and get some public input, but public input is not something this government is looking for.

As the Drummond report said, 28% of what this province is spending on health care is actually wasted

and has no impact. It's time that we look at what we're doing and where we're going.

It's interesting that he talks about his favourite book, *Minding the Public Purse*, because this government has been very good at minding that public purse when it's increased and added over 100 new taxes and fees over the last eight years. It truly is an expert, and I can see that he must have had that book out for the eight years, because they're after him and trying to get it back.

But I think it just looks at needing some strategy, and we're not seeing that. We look at the Green Energy Act and where it's gone. We see hydro rates that are going up 45% over the next four years, and is there any reason why we wouldn't think they wouldn't, with plans where you start to build plants, like in Mississauga and Oakville, and then turn around and cancel them? Unfortunately, it's a bad way of getting \$1 billion worth of spending in jobs, because now they have to go back and take them down.

So we're looking at this government and asking for a strategy that actually works in getting our people in Ontario working again—600,000 people unemployed. I think it's time to act, and they're asking for action.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for Nickel Belt.

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** It is my pleasure to add a few words to what my colleague from Toronto–Danforth had to say about this bill, Bill 11, the Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act in southwestern Ontario. As some of my colleagues have explained, is there a need for job creation? Absolutely. This recession that doesn't know when to end has put a lot of people out of work in that region of the province, as well as many other regions. Do we support job creation? Absolutely.

Why is it that we have a bill in front of us that would put a mechanism to flow funds, but doesn't talk about job guarantees? How could it be, after we've talked for many, many years about how, when government is going to help the private sector develop our economy, there has to be a link to the workers? Because if it doesn't create wealth for the people of Ontario, if it doesn't create good, stable jobs for the people of Ontario, then we see what happens. We've seen what happened in London, where they took government money, closed up shop and out they go—with all of their workers, through no fault of their own, finding themselves without a job.

It is the kind of bill that has a good name: the Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act. In the title it says "creating jobs," but in the bill, it doesn't say that it will have job guarantees. It doesn't say that there will be strings attached to that money so that, if you don't create the jobs you had talked about, the money won't flow, and if you break that promise the money will be clawed back. None of that is in the bill. It's a very cute title; a little bit light on some of the important points.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. The member for Peterborough.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Thanks very much, Madam Speaker, and I enjoyed the remarks this afternoon from the member from Toronto–Danforth.

I understand with the southwestern development fund, there is consultation going on in St. Catharines, Hamilton and Niagara and other parts of the Niagara peninsula. I don't usually read the St. Catharines Standard, but I just happen to have an excerpt from Saturday, February 25. There's a nice picture of Jim Bradley here.

*Interjections.*

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Well, I am. I'm going to get there.

But I know that the member from Toronto—Danforth, if he happened to have had the opportunity to read the St. Catharines Standard last Saturday, would have seen a company that's growing in Thorold, Ontario: a solar farm, the type of company that I believe will be supported through the southwestern development fund. It's also a very nice picture of the energy minister, Mr. Bentley, at the same event.

So if you take the opportunity to read this article, you can see the kind of expansion that's helping and going on in the Niagara Peninsula, the opportunities that will present themselves with the establishment of the southwestern development fund—a real opportunity for businesses in that area.

**1800**

Lots of good stories in the Peterborough Examiner, too. I have my picture in there every once in a while cutting a ribbon at a business that just got support from the eastern Ontario development fund.

But I must say, just recently I know the great mayor of Cornwall, Ontario, Bob Kilger—Bob Kilger was one of the great referees in the National Hockey League, and I know that Bob—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. The member for Toronto—Danforth has two minutes to respond.

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to respond. First, to the member Mr. Bradley and his comments about the NDP coming in to clean up the mess after a tax-cutting government: I know, Speaker, that this government is talking about the desperate situation that the province's books are in, about the report from Mr. Drummond, and I have to ask, is it the case that Mr. McGuinty didn't get the straight goods from the previous government about the state of the province's finances when he ran in the last election? Was he surprised when he got elected to find out the perilous situation we were in?

I appreciate the comments from the members from Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, from Nickel Belt, from St. Catharines, from Peterborough. You're right, member from Peterborough: I should read the St. Catharines Standard more often to see the paid political announcements put in by the Liberals lauding their achievements and featuring pictures of their ministers.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Paid for by our tax dollars.

*Interjections.*

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** It may well be. But from now on I will check that paper more religiously, because if there's

anything I need more in my life, it's more pictures of Jim Bradley smiling at me.

Madam Speaker, enough of the levity. People need jobs. I wish this bill was going to actually address what was needed and the way it was needed. This bill, Madam Speaker, is very, very weak indeed.

*Second reading debate deemed adjourned.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Pursuant to standing order 39, the question that this House do now adjourn is deemed to have been made.

## ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

### SKILLED TRADES

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member from Simcoe North has given dissatisfaction with the answer to a question given today by the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities. The member has up to five minutes to debate the matter and the parliamentary assistant may reply for up to five minutes.

We'll just wait until members have exited.

Okay, the member from Simcoe North.

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** Madam Speaker, thank you very much for the opportunity this evening to say a few words. The reason I called for the late show is that I asked a question to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities today and I simply got no answer whatsoever.

The question I asked was about why the government would host a partisan reception here at Queen's Park at the expense of the taxpayers, because if the College of Trades is paying for it, quite simply, it's being funded by the Ontario taxpayers. It's a partisan event because only the parliamentary assistant and the minister were asked to speak at it—no members of the official opposition. That's to begin with. I think that's very unfair that they would do that. But I understand why. We all know the connection to the Working Families Coalition, and the Working Families Coalition's connection to the College of Trades. It's as simple as that.

Why I wanted to get to this point is that it goes back to a question I asked last week in the Legislature when I asked the minister about the College of Trades. He responded that, you know what—he said everyone he's talking to out there is in favour of the College of Trades. They think it's a wonderful thing. That's what the minister said. Yet, I know that he has met with people, and I have met with the same people, who represent over 2,000 companies in the province of Ontario and 80,000 workers in Ontario, and they're very concerned about the College of Trades. They want it either scrapped or completely restructured.

First of all, the governance body is completely unfair; it's made up of Working Families Coalition types and a couple of other people's names that are thrown in there

just to make it look like there might be some kind of reason about it.

Second of all, what it doesn't do, Madam Speaker—the College of Trades has a mandate for compulsory certification of all trades, without any grandfathering. They will not talk about grandfathering of trades. There are literally thousands of employees, workers across Ontario, whether it's in the road-building industry, whether it's in construction of any type—

**Mr. Rick Nicholls:** Electricians.

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** Now, electrical, for example, is a compulsory certified trade. It's already covered. But there are all kinds of trades—drywallers, welders—that don't require the full apprenticeship program. Our concern is that if you take men and women who are in their 50s and 60s and you expect them to go back and do an apprenticeship, complete with all of the schooling, the time they would need to spend at school—and already these are the people who are doing the jobs. They are the people that you can send out west to work on pipelines, on high-pressure lines, if they're a welder; the people who can grade a parking lot perfectly with a bulldozer or run an excavator in road construction types of things. They would no longer be considered a trade or an apprentice; they would now have to be compulsorily certified by the Working Families—by the College of Trades. That is what I'm getting at. The minister doesn't agree with that. He thinks that everyone loves the College of Trades. Nothing could be further from the truth.

And now what we're hearing—this is what's happening—is that now the automotive sector is finally waking up to what's happening with the College of Trades, and all of these garages etc. out there, and people who do body work on vehicles etc., are now starting to understand, “This is coming at us.” Right now, if you're a licensed electrician in the province of Ontario, ladies and gentlemen, you get your licence in the mail from the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities. It costs you \$60 for three years. Already, we know that the number the College of Trades is throwing at tradespeople is between \$100 and \$150 per year for them to join the College of Trades and get their licences. How many tradespeople out there actually know that's happening? Hardly anyone. They're going to sneak it in the back door.

So what are they doing? They want \$31 million from this government this year to do compulsory certification. That's why they want to have the lobby day: to make sure all these people on the government side are down there having their food and their fancy cheeses etc., and they're convincing them that this is the right thing to do.

That's all I was talking about here today. I want an answer: Who was paying for that tonight? We were invited, but we're not allowed to speak, so it is automatically a partisan event. It's completely partisan, and as far as I'm concerned, in this assembly it's completely illegal. It should not be paid for by the taxpayers of the province of Ontario, to have a partisan event and support

an organization like the College of Trades, which we all know in truth is the Working Families Coalition at heart.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, for this opportunity.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The parliamentary assistant has up to five minutes to respond.

**Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** Thank you, Speaker. It's a pleasure to respond to the member's comments about the information session that's being hosted right now as we speak by the Ontario College of Trades.

Let me state from the outset that all of the numbers that I've heard quoted by the member opposite are incorrect and are grossly overstated. The session here tonight is to ensure that all members of the House have access to accurate information about the exciting new initiative with the College of Trades in Ontario. It's taking place in rooms 228 and 230. They've invited all members of the Legislature, including the member opposite, to attend and to learn more about Ontario's apprenticeships and skilled trades.

It's an opportunity for all members of the House to meet the board of governors of the college, the leaders of business, skilled workers, the unions, the educators and the trainers, and the representatives of the public at large who serve on the College of Trades. It's an opportunity for all members of the House to ask questions of this diverse and very enthusiastic group. It's also an opportunity for all members to learn more about the exciting institution that is going to help build apprenticeship training in this province. It's an event where members can listen to what board members have to say about how the creation of the college is going.

Speaker, our government is the first in Canada to make apprenticeship a priority. We've doubled the apprentices currently being trained in Ontario, to 120,000. Not only that; we're enrolling more than 29,000 apprentices each year. It's nearly double the apprentices under the previous government.

We created the Ontario College of Trades to work with us to ensure that the best apprenticeship is available for all Ontarians. It's the first of its kind in all of North America. It's driven by the industries that it represents: for the trades and by the trades. The college is going to give the skilled trades sector ownership of decisions that are critical to their practices and their own businesses and industry. It's going to align apprenticeship training directly with the needs of industry. It's going to provide balanced leadership that considers the needs of employers, employees, apprentices, the economy and the public at large. It's going to give industry the responsibility to make those critical decisions, including decisions about training ratios, and in a more accountable and clear process than has existed in the past.

It's going to provide industry and skilled workers with a platform to promote skilled trades careers and apprenticeship training to young people in Ontario, and that's going to create a new generation of skilled workers for Ontario.

They've hired a permanent CEO and registrar, Bob Guthrie. They've elected a chair, Ron Johnson. We're

confident in the leadership of Mr. Ron Johnson, the former Conservative member from Brantford. Honourable members who are attending today's information session will be able to learn much more about these two gentlemen. They're going to have an opportunity to meet the men and women who are building the College of Trades right here in Ontario.

Members of the member's own party, the Conservative Party, have RSVP'd that they are attending tonight. Let me give you the names of some of those members who have indicated that they will be attending. Michael Harris will be attending, for example—the member for Kitchener—Conestoga. The member for Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, Jim McDonnell, is attending. The member from Chatham—Kent—Essex has indicated that he'd like to attend and learn. Now 19 members have indicated that they'll attend. For some reason, the member is not attending himself, and I think, as the critic for apprenticeships, that his job is to be there.

I'd like to invite the member opposite to attend and all members who are tonight to attend. I regret to inform them that there will be no alcohol served. That shouldn't stop them, though. I still think they should go anyway.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. It has been an opportunity to illustrate to the people of Ontario and, I hope, to the member opposite—

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** But who's paying for it?

**Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** —that the progress that's being made by this College of Trades is something that the people of Ontario really want to see for young people who want to enter the skilled trades in the province of Ontario. We had a very, very clear legal opinion from the ministry today—and I'd ask the member to make these accusations outside of the House. But we've had a very, very clear legal opinion from the ministry that we're clearly not violating any laws by doing this. I think that you have cast shadows and aspersions on some volunteers. I say, you go to the reception, look at these people in the eye and have the courage to make the accusations that you've made.

#### ABORIGINAL LAND DISPUTE

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for Haldimand—Norfolk has given—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Would you take the comments outside, please.

The member for Haldimand—Norfolk has given notice of dissatisfaction with the answer to a question given today by the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. The minister has up to five minutes to respond.

The member for Haldimand—Norfolk.

**Mr. Toby Barrett:** Thank you, Speaker. As you've noticed, I have requested this late show debate because of my dissatisfaction with the minister's answer and a question concerning the government's proposed talks on future uses of Douglas Creek Estates in Caledonia.

I point out from the outset that my dissatisfaction results from the fact that the aboriginal affairs minister, despite announcing proposals for discussions on future uses of Douglas Creek Estates last week, had no information when I asked for details this morning; no answers whatsoever as to my stated questions, and I repeat, who will be at the table, where will these meetings occur, when will they happen, how much will it cost? Finally, what's going on? Where's the public consultation? Where's the transparency in this process with respect to such a volatile ongoing situation down at Caledonia?

Today marks six years—no answers from this government. Quite frankly, for those who have been forced to live through six years marked by chaos, intimidation and home invasion, answers are the least that this government must provide—certainly not another round of secret meetings.

To go back, it was on February 28, 2006, that Dawn Smith and Janie Jamison blocked the entrance to DCE in Caledonia. I have walked back in there probably 16 times now to speak with the militants, and I can report, six years later, that the scars of the resulting mayhem remain and continue to seed division in our community. It blocks home building, commercial and industrial development. To this day, a once-promising subdivision, something like 600 homes at present—I would have been there Sunday night—features warrior flags, occupiers in the model home, a burned-out tractor trailer and a hydro tower barricade. The subdivision remains undeveloped and untouchable.

To mention the hydro towers that come in from Niagara, again through intimidation, six years ago that project stopped. It's a project that runs between Douglas Creek Estates, Caledonia and Six Nations.

So, Speaker, six years of lost economic activity, not only in Caledonia; in Haldimand, in Brant county, in the city of Brantford. Businesses, homeowners and investments very simply have been scared away by the threat of confrontation and violence.

At one time, and up until six years ago, Haldimand county was home to the fastest-growing small town in Canada: Caledonia. We have now seen, from Haldimand itself, a 1.5% decline in population. By the most recent census data, the community has lost 650 residents, in part from the dismal economic conditions locally and the erosion of justice and the rule of law, government policy and the democratic process.

The recent sentencing of Richard Smoke in the beating of Caledonia's Sam Gualtieri reignited much of the debate yet again with respect to two-tiered justice. Regrettably, the apparent tolerance of those in authority for chaos and intimidation has resulted in a mistrust and a loss of confidence in our institutions, not only of this government but of policing, justice and governments in general.

You'll understand: People in my area are frustrated. They truly need to know what's going on, particularly when the government starts talking about future uses for

an area taxpayers paid for but are not allowed to set foot on. They want to know, when the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs follows their DCE proposal with statements inferring that “at the heart of the matter is a 200-year-old land claim”—I made note of this this morning. There’s no land claim. There are a number of valid land claims throughout the Haldimand tract area, but not on this subdivision. Chief federal negotiator Ron Doering noted in November 2007, “In this particular case, Douglas Creek is not a valid claim”—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Your time has expired.

The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I really am very happy to have an opportunity to provide clarification to the member for Haldimand–Norfolk on the status of the Douglas Creek Estates lands.

As the member well knows, there’s a lengthy history to the issue that extends back 200 years. More recently, the lands of Douglas Creek Estates are a part of a number of unresolved land claims filed by Six Nations with the federal government, going back to 1987. The claim is also part of active litigation commenced by the Six Nations in 1995 against Canada and Ontario.

But if we look at some more recent history, we’ll see that in September 2006, Six Nations had 28 outstanding land claims with the federal government. It’s those outstanding land claims that led some members of the community to conduct protests on development sites.

It’s frustrating to me, and I would think it would be frustrating to the MPP opposite, that the land claims main table, led by the federal government, has not met since October 8, 2009. We have to remember that Six Nations is adamant that it has an outstanding claim, an outstanding grievance with regard to the Douglas Creek Estates lands. Six Nations rejects Canada’s assertion that there was a valid surrender of Plank Road. Furthermore, Six Nations is still in active litigation about these lands.

I have to point out at the same time that Canada rejects Six Nations’ claims. But we’re talking about semantics here. Canada’s rejection of the claim does not solve anything. Six Nations still maintains a grievance that needs to be dealt with, and the only two parties who can address the grievance are Canada and Six Nations. Madam Speaker, only the federal government can resolve the underlying issues surrounding the Six Nations land claims. In the interim, Ontario will continue to work with all parties, including municipalities, to try to resolve the issue, but ultimately it is up to both parties, Canada and Six Nations, to come together.

What we, Ontario, have always maintained is that issues around land use, development and consultation are best resolved through discussion. We believe that locally proposed solutions are the best solutions, so Ontario will

continue to work in partnership with municipalities and Six Nations to find solutions that arise around development. But I think it’s important to remember that there is some progress being made. Sometimes the good things that are happening aren’t given the recognition that they deserve. I’m working to build a consensus among leaders on the ways to move forward regarding land-related matters in the Haldimand tract.

You know, even if I accepted the analysis of the member opposite, it doesn’t lead to a conclusion that doing nothing is the answer, so since my appointment as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, I’ve made a concerted effort to reach out to all the parties involved and to urge them to work together to resolve their differences. I’ve met with the Six Nations elected chief; I’ve met with the mayor of Brant, the city of Brantford and Haldimand county to discuss the need to renew the negotiations on economic development and the future use of Douglas Creek Estates lands.

Canada’s negotiation staff confirmed with Ontario that Canada awaits the appointment of a new negotiator for the community. I’m encouraged that the Conservative federal member of Parliament for Brant is quoted in the media saying, “Canada stands ready to settle Six Nations’ land claims. We have stood and continue to stand ready to do that job.” Meanwhile, as a province, we’re working with everyone involved—Six Nations, local municipalities, residents, developers and private industry—to help build better relationships.

But we’re not alone in the desire to build goodwill. We’re supported by the efforts of many area residents. I want to specifically talk about the pen pal program between Caledonia and Six Nations students. There are about 1,800 students from Haldimand county, Hamilton, Six Nations and Mississauga of the New Credit involved today. I think, Madam Speaker, that we could take a lesson from those kids. They’re working to come together to build consensus and community.

We need the federal government to get back to the table. The federal government has been absent for a number of years. We need action. Ontario will continue to urge them to come back to the table, and I would strongly urge the member for Haldimand–Norfolk to help us in this endeavour. I urge him to reach out to his federal colleagues and tell them that they need to get back to work to resolve this issue and to work with all parties involved. I expect—I presume that that is the role of MPPs: to work for harmony, to work for the resolution of issues. I look to the member to join us in that.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** This House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow morning, February 29.

*The House adjourned at 1824.*

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: Hon. / L'hon. David C. Onley, O.Ont.

Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Dave Levac

Clerk / Greffière: Deborah Deller

Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman, Tonia Grannum

Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Albanese, Laura (LIB)	York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston	
Armstrong, Teresa J. (NDP)	London–Fanshawe	
<b>Arnott, Ted (PC)</b>	Wellington–Haltoun Hills	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée
Bailey, Robert (PC)	Sarnia–Lambton	
<b>Balkissoon, Bas (LIB)</b>	Scarborough–Rouge River	Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée Deputy Speaker / Vice-président
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand–Norfolk	
<b>Bartolucci, Hon. / L'hon. Rick (LIB)</b>	Sudbury	Chair of Cabinet / Président du Conseil des ministres Minister of Northern Development and Mines / Ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
<b>Bentley, Hon. / L'hon. Christopher (LIB)</b>	London West / London-Ouest	Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie
Berardinetti, Lorenzo (LIB)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	
<b>Best, Hon. / L'hon. Margaret R. (LIB)</b>	Scarborough–Guildwood	Minister of Consumer Services / Ministre des Services aux consommateurs
Bisson, Gilles (NDP)	Timmins–James Bay / Timmins–Baie James	House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire de parti reconnu
<b>Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (LIB)</b>	St. Catharines	Minister of the Environment / Ministre de l'Environnement Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
<b>Broten, Hon. / L'hon. Laurel C. (LIB)</b>	Etobicoke–Lakeshore	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation Minister Responsible for Women's Issues / Ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Campbell, Sarah (NDP)	Kenora–Rainy River	
Chansfield, Donna H. (LIB)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	
<b>Chan, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Markham–Unionville	Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport / Ministre de Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport
<b>Chiarelli, Hon. / L'hon. Bob (LIB)</b>	Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Minister of Infrastructure / Ministre de l'Infrastructure Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Halton	
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds–Grenville	
Colle, Mike (LIB)	Eglinton–Lawrence	
Coteau, Michael (LIB)	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	
Crack, Grant (LIB)	Glengarry–Prescott–Russell	
Craitor, Kim (LIB)	Niagara Falls	
Damerla, Dipika (LIB)	Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville	
Delaney, Bob (LIB)	Mississauga–Streetsville	
Dhillon, Vic (LIB)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Dickson, Joe (LIB)	Ajax–Pickering	
DiNovo, Cheri (NDP)	Parkdale–High Park	
<b>Dnuguid, Hon. / L'hon. Brad (LIB)</b>	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Minister of Economic Development and Innovation / Ministre du Développement économique et de l'Innovation Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / Président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement Deputy Premier / Vice-premier ministre
<b>Duncan, Hon. / L'hon. Dwight (LIB)</b>	Windsor–Tecumseh	Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances
Dunlop, Garfield (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	
Elliott, Christine (PC)	Whitby–Oshawa	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Fedeli, Victor (PC)	Nipissing	Deputy House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire adjointe de parti reconnu
Flynn, Kevin Daniel (LIB)	Oakville	
Forster, Cindy (NDP)	Welland	
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	Attorney General / Procureur général
<b>Gerretsen, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles	
<b>Gravelle, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Thunder Bay–Superior North / Thunder Bay–Superior-Nord	
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	Minister of Natural Resources / Ministre des Richesses naturelles
Harris, Michael (PC)	Kitchener–Conestoga	
Hillier, Randy (PC)	Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington	
Horwath, Andrea (NDP)	Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre	Leader, Recognized Party / Chef de parti reconnu
<b>Hoskins, Hon. / L'hon. Eric (LIB)</b>	St. Paul's	Leader, New Democratic Party of Ontario / Chef du Nouveau parti démocratique de l'Ontario
Hudak, Tim (PC)	Niagara West–Glanbrook / Niagara-Ouest–Glanbrook	Minister of Children and Youth Services / Ministre des Services à l'enfance et à la jeunesse
Jackson, Rod (PC)	Barrie	Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle
Jaczek, Helena (LIB)	Oak Ridges–Markham	Leader, Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur de l'Ontario
<b>Jeffrey, Hon. / L'hon. Linda (LIB)</b>	Brampton–Springdale	Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail
Jones, Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin–Caledon	Minister Responsible for Seniors / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires des personnes âgées
Klees, Frank (PC)	Newmarket–Aurora	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Kwinter, Monte (LIB)	York Centre / York-Centre	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
Leal, Jeff (LIB)	Peterborough	
Leone, Rob (PC)	Cambridge	
<b>Levac, Hon. / L'hon. Dave (LIB)</b>	Brant	Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / Ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
MacCharles, Tracy (LIB)	Pickering–Scarborough East / Pickering–Scarborough-Est	
MacLaren, Jack (PC)	Carleton–Mississippi Mills	
MacLeod, Lisa (PC)	Nepean–Carleton	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales
Mangat, Amrit (LIB)	Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud	
Mantha, Michael (NDP)	Algoma–Manitoulin	
Marchese, Rosario (NDP)	Trinity–Spadina	Premier / Premier ministre
<b>Matthews, Hon. / L'hon. Deborah (LIB)</b>	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Leader, Government / Chef du gouvernement
Mauro, Bill (LIB)	Thunder Bay–Atikokan	Leader, Liberal Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti libéral de l'Ontario
McDonell, Jim (PC)	Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
<b>McGuinty, Hon. / L'hon. Dalton (LIB)</b>	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	
McKenna, Jane (PC)	Burlington	
<b>McMeekin, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (LIB)</b>	Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough–Westdale	Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / Ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels
McNaughton, Monte (PC)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	
McNeely, Phil (LIB)	Ottawa–Orléans	
<b>Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (LIB)</b>	Ottawa–Vanier	Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones
Miller, Norm (PC)	Parry Sound–Muskoka	Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Miller, Paul (NDP)</b>	Hamilton East–Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est–Stoney Creek	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Milligan, Rob E. (PC)	Northumberland—Quinte West	Minister of Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement
<b>Millroy, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	
Moridi, Reza (LIB)	Richmond Hill	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Munro, Julia (PC)</b>	York—Simcoe	
<b>Murray, Hon. / L'hon. Glen R. (LIB)</b>	Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Naqvi, Yasir (LIB)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration / Ministre des Affaires civiques et de l'Immigration
Natyshak, Taras (NDP)	Essex	
Nicholls, Rick (PC)	Chatham—Kent—Essex	
O'Toole, John (PC)	Durham	
Orazietti, David (LIB)	Sault Ste. Marie	
Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Oshawa	
Pettapiece, Randy (PC)	Perth—Wellington	
Piruzza, Teresa (LIB)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	
Prue, Michael (NDP)	Beaches—East York	
Qaadri, Shafiq (LIB)	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	
Sandals, Liz (LIB)	Guelph	
Schein, Jonah (NDP)	Davenport	
Scott, Laurie (PC)	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	
Sergio, Mario (LIB)	York West / York-Ouest	
Shurman, Peter (PC)	Thornhill	
Singh, Jagmeet (NDP)	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	
Smith, Todd (PC)	Prince Edward—Hastings	
Sorbara, Greg (LIB)	Vaughan	
<b>Sousa, Hon. / L'hon. Charles (LIB)</b>	Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud	Minister of Government Services / Ministre des Services gouvernementaux
Tabuns, Peter (NDP)	Toronto—Danforth	
<b>Takhar, Hon. / L'hon. Harinder S. (LIB)</b>	Mississauga—Erindale	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain	
Thompson, Lisa M. (PC)	Huron—Bruce	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Vanthof, John (NDP)	Timiskaming—Cochrane	
Walker, Bill (PC)	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Wilson, Jim (PC)	Simcoe—Grey	
Witmer, Elizabeth (PC)	Kitchener—Waterloo	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Wong, Soo (LIB)	Scarborough—Agincourt	
<b>Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (LIB)</b>	Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Yakabuski, John (PC)	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	
Yurek, Jeff (PC)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Zimmer, David (LIB)	Willowdale	

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉ PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Standing Committee on Estimates / Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Grant Crack, Kim Craitor  
Vic Dhillon, Michael Harris  
Rob Leone, Taras Natyshak  
Rick Nicholls, Michael Prue  
Mario Sergio  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs /  
Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Bob Delaney, Victor Fedeli  
Cindy Forster, Monte McNaughton  
Yasir Naqvi, Teresa Piruzza  
Michael Prue, Peter Shurman  
Soo Wong  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on General Government / Comité  
permanent des affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Sarah Campbell, Michael Coteau  
Joe Dickson, Rosario Marchese  
David Oraziotti, Laurie Scott  
Todd Smith, Jeff Yurek  
David Zimmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przedziecki

**Standing Committee on Government Agencies / Comité  
permanent des organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Donna H. Cansfield, Helena Jaczek  
Bill Mauro, Jim McDonell  
Phil McNeely, Randy Pettapiece  
Peter Tabuns, Monique Taylor  
Lisa M. Thompson  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Justice Policy / Comité permanent de  
la justice**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Laura Albanese, Teresa J. Armstrong  
Lorenzo Berardinetti, Mike Colle  
Frank Klees, Jack MacLaren  
Paul Miller, Rob E. Milligan  
Shafiq Qaadri  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly / Comité  
permanent de l'Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Laura Albanese, Bas Balkissoon  
Gilles Bisson, Donna H. Cansfield  
Steve Clark, Garfield Dunlop  
Jeff Leal, Lisa MacLeod  
Jonah Schein  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts / Comité permanent  
des comptes publics**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Toby Barrett, France Gélinas  
Phil McNeely, Norm Miller  
Reza Moridi, Jerry J. Ouellette  
Liz Sandals, Jagmeet Singh  
David Zimmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills / Comité  
permanent des règlements et des projets de loi d'intérêt privé**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Michael Coteau, Grant Crack  
Vic Dhillon, Randy Hillier  
Rod Jackson, Mario Sergio  
Peter Tabuns, John Vanthof  
Bill Walker  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Tamara Pomanski

**Standing Committee on Social Policy / Comité permanent de  
la politique sociale**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Ted Chudleigh, Dipika Damerla  
Cheri DiNovo, Kevin Daniel Flynn  
Ernie Hardeman, Tracy MacCharles  
Amrit Mangat, Michael Mantha  
Jane McKenna  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS / DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

<b>Government's record</b>	
Mr. Monte McNaughton .....	699
<b>Doug Rapelje</b>	
Ms. Cindy Forster .....	700
<b>Anti-bullying campaign</b>	
Mr. Joe Dickson .....	700
<b>Advanced agricultural leadership program</b>	
Ms. Lisa M. Thompson .....	700
<b>Recreational infrastructure</b>	
Mrs. Liz Sandals .....	700
<b>Ron Schlegel</b>	
Mr. Michael Harris .....	701
<b>Automobile insurance</b>	
Mr. Jagmeet Singh .....	701
<b>Heart Month</b>	
Mr. Bas Balkissoon .....	701
<b>Automotive Centre of Excellence</b>	
Mrs. Christine Elliott .....	701
<b>Notice of dissatisfaction</b>	
The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac) .....	702

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS / DÉPÔT DES PROJETS DE LOI

<b>Master's College and Seminary Act (Tax Relief), 2012, Bill Pr3, Mr. Leal</b>	
First reading agreed to .....	702

## PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS

<b>Long-term care</b>	
Mr. Ernie Hardeman .....	702
<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. Todd Smith .....	702
<b>Diagnostic services</b>	
Mme France Gélinas .....	702
<b>Ontario Place</b>	
Mr. Rob E. Milligan .....	703
<b>Kidney disease</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal .....	703
<b>Health care funding</b>	
Mr. Jim Wilson .....	703
<b>Education funding</b>	
Mr. Phil McNeely .....	703

<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. Michael Harris .....	703
<b>Baitfish industry</b>	
Mr. John Yakabuski .....	704
<b>Baitfish industry</b>	
Ms. Laurie Scott .....	704
<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. John Yakabuski .....	704
<b>Baitfish industry</b>	
Ms. Laurie Scott .....	704
<b>Renewable energy</b>	
Mr. Jim Wilson .....	704
<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. Todd Smith .....	705
<b>Baitfish industry</b>	
Mr. John Yakabuski .....	705

## ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

<b>Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act, 2012, Bill 11, Mr. Duguid / Loi de 2012 visant à attirer les investissements et à créer des emplois, projet de loi 11, M. Duguid</b>	
Mr. Peter Shurman .....	705
Mr. Michael Prue .....	708
Hon. James J. Bradley .....	708
Mr. Jim Wilson .....	709
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong .....	709
Mr. Peter Shurman .....	709
Mr. Michael Prue .....	710
Mr. Joe Dickson .....	712
Ms. Laurie Scott .....	713
Mr. Paul Miller .....	713
Mr. Jeff Leal .....	714
Mr. Michael Prue .....	714
Mr. Phil McNeely .....	714
Ms. Dipika Damerla .....	716
Mr. John Yakabuski .....	716
Mr. Paul Miller .....	717
Mr. Jeff Leal .....	717
Ms. Laurie Scott .....	717
Mr. Phil McNeely .....	718
Mr. Rick Nicholls .....	718
Miss Monique Taylor .....	721
Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn .....	721
Mr. Todd Smith .....	721
Mr. Michael Prue .....	722
Mr. Rick Nicholls .....	722
Mr. Peter Tabuns .....	722
Hon. James J. Bradley .....	725
Mr. Jim McDonnell .....	725

Mme France G��linas.....	725
Mr. Jeff Leal .....	725
Mr. Peter Tabuns .....	726
Second reading debate deemed adjourned.....	726

# **ADJOURNMENT DEBATE / D  BAT SUR LA MOTION D'AJOURNEMENT**

## **Skilled trades**

Mr. Garfield Dunlop .....	726
Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn.....	727

## **Aboriginal land dispute**

Mr. Toby Barrett.....	728
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne.....	729

# CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Tuesday 28 February 2012 / Mardi 28 février 2012

## ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

<b>Security for Courts, Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012, Bill 34, Mrs. Meilleur / Loi de 2012 sur la sécurité des tribunaux, des centrales électriques et des installations nucléaires, projet de loi 34, Mme Meilleur</b>	
Hon. Madeleine Meilleur .....	683
Ms. Soo Wong .....	685
Mr. John O'Toole .....	687
Ms. Cheri DiNovo .....	687
Mr. Jeff Leal .....	687
Ms. Sylvia Jones .....	688
Hon. Madeleine Meilleur .....	688
Second reading debate adjourned .....	688

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Mr. Robert Bailey .....	688
Mr. Paul Miller .....	688
Mr. Yasir Naqvi .....	689
Ms. Laurie Scott .....	689
Ms. Lisa M. Thompson .....	689
Mr. Jeff Yurek .....	689
The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac) .....	689

## ORAL QUESTIONS / QUESTIONS ORALES

### Taxation

Mr. Tim Hudak .....	689
Hon. Dalton McGuinty .....	689

### Taxation

Mr. Tim Hudak .....	690
Hon. Dwight Duncan .....	690
Hon. Dalton McGuinty .....	691

### Executive compensation

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	691
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	691

### Air ambulance service

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	692
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	692

### Air ambulance service

Mr. Frank Klees .....	692
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	693

### Air ambulance service

Mr. Taras Natyshak .....	693
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	693

### Full-day kindergarten

Ms. Dipika Damerla .....	693
Hon. Laurel C. Broten .....	694

### Air ambulance service

Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer .....	694
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	694

### Pan Am Games

Mr. Paul Miller .....	695
Hon. Charles Sousa .....	695

### Skilled trades

Mr. David Oraziatti .....	695
Hon. Glen R. Murray .....	695

### Skilled trades

Mr. Garfield Dunlop .....	696
Hon. Glen R. Murray .....	696

### Long-term care

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	696
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	697

### Assistance to farmers

Ms. Helena Jaczek .....	697
Hon. Ted McMeekin .....	697

### Aboriginal land dispute

Mr. Toby Barrett .....	697
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne .....	697

### Infrastructure renewal

Ms. Cindy Forster .....	698
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne .....	698

### Pan Am Games

Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti .....	699
Hon. Charles Sousa .....	699

### Notice of dissatisfaction

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac) .....	699
-------------------------------------	-----

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Mr. Jeff Leal .....	699
Mr. Joe Dickson .....	699

*Continued on inside back cover*



No. 18

N° 18

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

First Session, 40<sup>th</sup> Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 40<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Wednesday 29 February 2012**

**Mercredi 29 février 2012**



Speaker  
Honourable Dave Levac

Président  
L'honorable Dave Levac

Clerk  
Deborah Deller

Greffière  
Deborah Deller

### **Hansard on the Internet**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

### **Le Journal des débats sur Internet**

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

### **Renseignements sur l'index**

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 29 February 2012

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mercredi 29 février 2012

*The House met at 0900.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Please join me in prayer.

*Prayers.*

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### SECURITY FOR COURTS, ELECTRICITY GENERATING FACILITIES AND NUCLEAR FACILITIES ACT, 2012

### LOI DE 2012 SUR LA SÉCURITÉ DES TRIBUNAUX, DES CENTRALES ÉLECTRIQUES ET DES INSTALLATIONS NUCLÉAIRES

Resuming the debate adjourned on February 28, 2012, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 34, An Act to repeal the Public Works Protection Act, amend the Police Services Act with respect to court security and enact the Security for Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012 / Projet de loi 34, Loi abrogeant la Loi sur la protection des ouvrages publics, modifiant la Loi sur les services policiers en ce qui concerne la sécurité des tribunaux et édictant la Loi de 2012 sur la sécurité des centrales électriques et des installations nucléaires.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further debate?

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I'm pleased to stand in my place and join the debate here this morning on Bill 34. I'm going to begin my remarks today by pointing out that we in the Progressive Conservative caucus, on this side of the House, will be supporting this legislation and supporting its passage on second reading.

Before the members on the government side all stand and rise in rapturous applause, I want to caution them: That could be the last good thing I have to say in this hour about them. There are going to be lots of good things, but I won't be singing their praises about bringing forth this legislation, because we're going to get down to the bare bones, Speaker, about why we're here debating this legislation before the House today.

The Public Works Protection Act—it's almost a tongue twister, I know—was passed in 1939. There are only a couple or a few, maybe, members of this Legislature who were even born in 1939, and only one could have actually understood what might have been going on in 1939. That's how long ago it was, Mr. Speaker. We have to put it into context about what was going on in 1939.

In September of that year, Hitler's Nazis invaded Poland, and there began the Second World War. As an ally of Poland and one that had an agreement with them, it brought Britain into the war; and as a member of the Commonwealth, that brought Canada into the war.

However, the United States was not compelled at that time to join the war. The Canadian government passed the War Measures Act, and the Ontario government of the time passed the Public Works Protection Act as a defence mechanism to ensure that they could protect their infrastructure at a time of war or possible terrorist attack, and particularly, I suppose, because the Americans were not in the war with them—although for all practical purposes we all know that the Americans were part of that war from day one and financed a great part of it, until the attack on Pearl Harbour in 1941. But even before that, you may recall, Speaker, that the ship Reuben James, an American ship that had acted as a protector for supply convoys going across the Atlantic, was destroyed by a Nazi U-boat prior to Pearl Harbour, and the history of the day will tell you that Hitler was extremely upset at the time because he was trying not to do anything to inflame the emotions of the Americans and bring them into that war sooner.

I just want to talk a little bit about what it was like at the time. We understand why—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I wasn't around. The Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure was pointing out that I wasn't around. No, I wasn't around. In fact, I wasn't born for many years after that.

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** I was close to being conceived.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I wasn't even close; my parents weren't yet married. But my father was a veteran of that war.

We have to understand what the mindset of the day was. If you look at this House—of course, there's no one in this House today who would have served in the Second World War or the Korean war, but in my dad's day, when he served in this House from 1963 to 1987, it was populated with many folks who had served in either of those wars. When he got here, maybe there was a veteran here from the First World War; I don't know.

It gives people a better understanding, I think; the members of the Houses in those days, too, had a more collegial understanding of one another, particularly members of the House who did serve in the wars, because they had a tremendously life-changing experience that none of us can pretend to know about, not having actually experienced it ourselves. We can read the history

books and we can talk to those people who did participate in those great events—and I don't say that in a positive way, just in the magnitude of them in our history.

I know that my dad never talked about the war. I only found out, actually, from my younger brother, who—obviously, there are some Yakabuski out there who are pretty smart. He studied at the Sorbonne in Paris. I never made it there. But my dad went over to visit him one time—and he's very fluently bilingual, in both Quebecois and Parisian French, I might say. My dad went over there to visit him one time, and that was the time that Mark found out that dad fought in the battle of Caen—huge battles after the invasion of Normandy, when the allies thought that Caen would be a natural same-day victory. It turned out to be a mess for months that resulted in many, many casualties on both sides. But as I say, he never talked about the war. I never got this information from him; I only found out about it from my brother. I suppose it should give me reason to want to research my own father's military record in a more extensive way, because I think it behooves us all to understand the sacrifices that people who went to war in those days—and still do; those who defend our interests across the world in Afghanistan and other theatres of war—we owe them a great debt of gratitude.

0910

But for my own part, I think it would behoove me, on a personal basis, to have a full compilation of what my own father's war record was, because I can tell you, I didn't get much from him. A lot of people who fought in that war were not really into talking about it: It wasn't a good time of their lives. It was a good time from the point of view that if they had to do it over again, I know each and every one of them would have stood up for their country and did it again. But it wasn't all fun and games as we enjoy the good life today, partly and substantially, I should say, on the efforts of those who came before us.

So I'm putting it into context a little bit. I've actually heard more about my dad's wartime from a couple of folks. When I was campaigning in my riding in the different elections, I've run into people who actually served in the military in the Second World War with my dad who are still living. One of them, Hayden Francis, I see quite often. In fact, I saw Hayden a couple of weeks back—90 years old and he has got to be chasing 91 if he hasn't turned already—walking down the street in Pembroke as I was driving to my constituency office, looking spry and as sharp as ever. I just had a brief conversation with Hayden, and he has always given me some recollections of his time with my dad in the war. One of the things they did when they came back, Hayden Francis and my dad, was they actually volunteered to go to Japan after the war with Germany had ended, while that battle was still raging.

Another gentleman, George Skerkowski—I saw George last week—served with Dad in the war as well. And where did I see George? George is a resident now of the Quail Creek retirement home in Renfrew. I was in there singing during the intercession time for the residents, and

I had a chat with George. But I also saw George just last week at the funeral of Charlie Lemenchick in Renfrew, another World War II veteran who has now left this world to the next. Charlie, of course, was one of the great athletes in the town of Renfrew's history, and we all knew him well. I've been a good friend of the family for many, many years. We're certainly going to miss Charlie, as Renfrew will for sure. But again, I had a chance to talk to George, who is also 90 years old and doing very, very well.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I'm just bringing into context what it was like in those days and why the Public Works Protection Act was a necessary thing at the time. It was a necessary piece of legislation. In fact, Speaker, you may be aware that—just the mindset of what Canada was like during those times, and particularly in the early part of the war. Everything was going Hitler's way. I mean, he started the war on his terms, on his time. Quite frankly, because of the wishes of the rest of the world that war would not actually happen, we were not prepared. We were not prepared for the onslaught of the blitzkrieg that the Nazis waged across Europe in the early part of the war. There was a tremendous fear that encapsulated all countries and Canada as well, because we were so aligned with our mother country, Britain.

In fact, in February 1942, in the city of Winnipeg, you may recall they had what they call a what-if day. I sometimes say, "What if I had won the lottery instead of getting elected here." I think when I got elected here—

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** You did win the lottery.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** —I did win the lottery. I thought the member for Kingston and the Islands and the Attorney General was actually snoozing over there. No way. He's listening closely to what I have to say.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** Take that back.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I take it back. But yes, I did win the lottery when I got elected here, absolutely. And I almost got to that, but he was quicker than me.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** No, that's the real lottery. Yeah, you're right, Jim.

Anyway, what-if day: In Winnipeg, on February 19, 1942, they had what they called a what-if day—you know how we do this; it's actually very beneficial. You'll see a hospital do a mock disaster, or the emergency response partners in a community—the paramedics, the hospitals, the police, the fire—will have a mock disaster, just so they can find out how their response people will perform in a simulated situation. The reality is that we don't really want these disasters to happen, but the only way we can test ourselves is if we—it's hard to create a terrible situation in real life, because that's not what we want to see. So they have these mock disasters, and it's a great opportunity, in a simulated way, to see how our first responders conduct themselves and perform under pressure.

So on February 19, 1942, in the city of Winnipeg, they had a what-if day. And the "what if" was, what if the Nazis invaded?

Does everybody remember Orson Welles and the War of the Worlds, and what a panic went on across North America when that was aired? It was Halloween night, I believe, 1930—something—somebody can help me here. Halloween night, 1930—something. Maybe the member from Peterborough might remember. It just caused a great panic as it was broadcast over the airwaves of radio at that time.

So what-if day was, what if the Nazis invaded? People were being interned and were being arrested, and it was quite scary.

But the reason behind it was to get people to buy war bonds. In February 1942, the war had not yet turned. It had not yet turned. Hitler was still winning the war. They were beginning to show some cracks, but he was still winning the war. So that was to try to encourage people to buy war bonds so that the war effort could be supported, because you can't win a war without money. It takes machines, it takes supplies, it takes munitions, and we were fighting a war halfway across the world. So it was very important to raise money.

That's my context, Mr. Speaker, on what it was like. That's my what-if day, 1939.

Now I'm going to get to the why, because that's the question everybody asks when it comes to the handling of the G20 summit here in Toronto and the way—

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Could the member from Durham take it down a couple of notches? I'm having trouble hearing the speaker. Thank you.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. That gives me a moment to have a pause—the pause that refreshes, as they say.

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** And only 43 minutes left to go.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Yes.

Let's get back to the order of the day, as they say. What is the mindset and what is the thinking that's going on, or was going on, over there, and a little bit over here at that time, because we still had a government rump on this side of the House. The election of 2011 has taken care of the rump. We're going after the shoulders and the arms in the next one. So the rump is gone. We've got a few more parts of the anatomy that we've got to take care of in the next go-round.

You have to ask yourself, what was the thinking of these people over there?

0920

I heard the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services say yesterday that the police requested this, or something to that effect. I'll paraphrase; I don't have the quote in front of me: The police requested this. Well, I'm going to bet you dollars to doughnuts that Bill Blair and the Toronto police commission, or whoever she refers to when she uses the term “police,” did not request the enactment of a regulation under the Public Works Protection Act. What the police may have asked for, Speaker, and rightfully so, is that we've got a major international event going on in this city that will be attended by the leaders of some of the most prosperous

and successful and influential countries of the world—would we like to be able to ensure order? If I'm a police officer, if I'm the chief of police, if I'm the mayor of Toronto, you betcha, I want to ensure order. That's important. We are a leading democracy in this world. We have to set an example and show an example that in this country we can have and do have and will have law and order—absolutely important.

However, the minister is trying to somehow—these folks over here have been here so long they're almost like royalty. I call them the barons of blame, because they are never at fault. It is always someone else's fault.

I see folks over here—my friend from Beaches—East York has been here a lot longer than me. He has seen it all.

**Interjection:** How long?

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Oh, I can't tell you. I think 1998 or so.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Oh, 2001. He was the last mayor of East York. They're going to do a—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** We seem to be taking it up a couple of decibels over here. I'd appreciate it if we cut it back. And I'd ask the member from Renfrew to speak through the Chair and not to the other members. Thank you.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Thank you, Speaker. Honestly, I thought I was speaking through the Chair, but I may have lost myself for a moment.

What I was only referring to is, of course, the record of the former mayor from East York and—what was that show? Al Waxman was in it, King of Kensington—I have to wander around sometimes, keep my feet moving, Speaker, because if I stand in one place too long, sometimes I lose my balance and topple over. What was that show? King of Kensington? Al Waxman?

**Interjection:** Yes.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I think there's going to be a sitcom someday called “The Last Mayor of East York.” I see it coming. Look, Hal Linden could have played you, but that's another matter altogether.

We really need to stick to the matter at hand, and that is the absolute failure of this government when it came to managing its business in the interests of the people and democracy when it invoked regulation 233/10. Remember that one, Speaker: 233/10. That was the regulation that was done behind the closed doors of cabinet. I should say that more like—we should have Rod Serling here: behind the closed doors of cabinet.

It happened while this body, this Legislature that is elected on behalf of the people of Ontario, was sitting. It did not happen during a recess. It didn't happen when there were bombs coming over. There was no emergency. There was a request on the part of the police to give them some assistance in ensuring that they could provide law and order during the summit. That was it. There was no imminent threat. This body—and you, Speaker, were here as a member of this body. You re-

member it well. We were here, prepared to stand on behalf of the people of Ontario. We were here, prepared to debate any legislation brought before us. We were denied. We were denied, as the elected body, and 13 million Ontarians were denied. Why?

I'm going to be coming back, but you know, it just gets so upsetting sometimes, Speaker, I have to just shift a little bit.

But it's kind of the way these folks operate. I'm getting nods. The heads are bowed over there. When you don't want to hear about something, you put your head down. When you don't want to respond to it, you put your head down. Like the young boy Johnny—it's always Johnny. Have you ever noticed that, Speaker? When they're making an example of the boy who has got in trouble, it's always Johnny. Sometimes I wonder about that. I asked my dad sometimes, "Why Johnny?"

But have you ever noticed how Johnny knows he has been caught in the act? This is not a prop, Mr. Speaker. This is the report of the Ontario Ombudsman to this Legislature. Johnny got caught—no, it doesn't say Johnny got caught in the act. It just says Caught in the Act. Well, you know, when Johnny gets caught in the act, his head goes down, and he doesn't really know what to say. But you know what I've always found about Johnny? And I've been that Johnny on more than one occasion. I accept the blame. I know I've been caught. But I do better than just saying, "I'm not going to do it again." I actually accept the punishment.

**Mr. Rob E. Milligan:** He does the honourable thing.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I do the honourable thing. Has the honourable thing happened over there? "No," they say. And you know why? Because, technically, nobody got fired over it.

Although, I may point out, Mr. Speaker, that on August 18, 2010—my daughter's 21st birthday, by the way, a beautiful girl. Must be like her mother; I know.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** You didn't give me a chance to say that.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Yeah, I know. I saw it coming, there, to the member from Peterborough. I saw it coming.

I'd fully admit that all of the best qualities that my children have inherited have come from their mother, my beautiful wife, Vicky.

*Interjections.*

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Yes, she is just a saint of a person, as she would have to be, to be married to me. I know. I understand that.

On August 18, 2010, the former Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services, in a very quiet cabinet shuffle, got shooshed out of his ministry, and the then Minister of the Environment, the member for St. Catharines, Mr. Bradley, became the minister.

They were under terrible pressure, because they'd messed it up so bad. The minister should have been fired, just as—and I'm going to just detour a little bit, but I am coming back, Speaker; I am coming back. How can we stand in this Legislature and be proud—on the government side, how can they be proud of what they're doing

when, each and every day, the scandal and the mess at Ornge grows deeper and more troubling to every single citizen of this province who has any objective view of anything?

When they read the horror stories about the stealing—that's what it is—stealing by people at Ornge. It's the taxpayers' money. Unaccounted, \$25 million—that's just the unaccounted. We didn't say the other \$250 million was spent right. It's a mess. But \$25 million isn't even accounted for. Think about that: \$25 million is missing, and the minister stands up and she defends the people at Ornge.

**0930**

We're not talking about the front-line people. We're not talking about the people who actually go there to assist that individual who is in trouble, whose health is threatened, whose life very well may be threatened. We're not talking about them; we're talking the people who are calling the shots. We're talking about the people who manage that cesspool, because that's what it's become.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Mismanaged it.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Mismanaged it; thank you very much. Their title is management; what they're doing is a joke, and it's a blight on this province. It's a blight on this government, but every day the minister stands in her place and refuses to accept responsibility.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** I would ask the member to return to the issue at hand. He seems to have stretched it a little bit. So if you could get back to what we're debating, I'd appreciate it.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You know me; I abide absolutely with your guidance, as you have been always kind to give it to me when I'm in need of it.

But I also, when I think of staying to the topic, I think—and I want to beg your indulgence on this one, Speaker—I am very much to the topic, because the reason we are here today is not because the government has enacted Bill 34, which will repeal the Public Works Protection Act. It is very much because—do you think we'd be here today repealing this act that was passed in 1939 if it wasn't for what happened in June 2010? Of course we wouldn't. Do you think some bureaucrat found this under a desk or behind an old Gestetner in one of the offices of one of the ministers, and said, "Oh, my goodness gracious, you know what? We have an act here that was passed in 1939. This is a pressing piece of business for the government. We better write a new act. We better update this. Holy frijole, I'm glad I happened to be cleaning."

No. That's not why we're here, Speaker. We're here because they were caught in the act. That's why we're here. We're not here because the government thought, "Oh, it's a good time to review our legislation." No, no, no. And what I'm trying to point out—and we have limited opportunity in this House, Speaker—is to talk about the mindset of those folks on the other side of the House, and particularly those people who sit in the

cabinet, because everyone knows that's where the real business is going on. Here, this is just practice; it's just like training camp. But the real business is going on in the cabinet, and I see members of the cabinet over there. They don't want to talk about it.

I have some notes here, and I'm going to start to refer to them. One thing about it is, we reached some times where we were—thank you very much. Oh, yes; okay. I just received a note because sometimes it is important to have the names.

So when this decision was made to pass, as I said—because you know me; I'm sticking to the issue. Doggedly, if I say so myself. I'm just looking for the date here, but the date of the passage of 233 is not absolutely important at this moment. But it is important to know that we were sitting as a Legislature. Not all my friends who are here now were here, but many of them were. A lot of the ones over there were. Some of them were in cabinet. Some of them may have been in this meeting that decided to circumvent, as André Marin said, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in the invoking of regulation 233/10. Remember that number: 233/10.

Thank you very much, Marium. Marium, your name is in Hansard on the very day that I think we're going to get to the bottom of this.

The whole cabinet was at the table for the passing of the regulation. Also at the table were the members for Peterborough, Ottawa Centre, Ottawa-Orléans, Mississauga—Streetsville, Willowdale, Bramalea-Gore-Malton, Ajax-Pickering and Algoma-Manitoulin. They all had seats at the table when this secret regulation, this G20 law, was stamped. So why didn't one of them speak up? While it was becoming apparent that this was a sad event when the events of G20 were taking place, it's interesting from July 9 to 26 when all of this was falling down like—I was going to say like rain, but no, it was like hail, or maybe I should say "hell."

The Premier was on vacation—nowhere to be seen July 9 to 26. He's the only groundhog that hibernates in the summertime.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** Speaker, come on.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Renfrew might want to retract the "groundhog" comment.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Withdrawn, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Thank you.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Just while we're still in the month of Wiarton Willie, I just thought that I wanted to make some reference to an iconic symbol up in the Bruce Peninsula, Wiarton Willie. As you know, February 2 is Groundhog Day, and nothing personal was intended by that, Speaker, of course.

Let's talk a little bit about André Marin. We all know André Marin.

**Interjection:** Great guy.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** Good guy.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** He's the Ombudsman. Over there, they're saying "great guy," "good guy." Well, I'm going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I was there when the debate was going on.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** Speaker, he should be addressing you.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I am addressing the Speaker. I was there when the debate was going on. Those folks over there wanted to get rid of André Marin so bad, they were salivating at the opportunity. I was in some of those meetings.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** We reappointed him.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** They reappointed him because there was only one reason: because we were not going to let them get away with it. We were not going to let them get away with it. They wanted to dump Marin, who has been an unbelievably dogged Ombudsman.

You know, it's interesting, Mr. Bradley said this about the Ombudsman's report. It's in here somewhere. Oh, yes.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Very thoughtful comments.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Oh, it was thoughtful, all right, but it was somewhat incomplete.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I'd better get Jim. He's in the back.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Yeah, bring him in. I'd love to hear from him.

"Hon. James J. Bradley: I would first of all note that the Ombudsman has stated in this report that the regulation, as passed by the government, had a 'laudable purpose.' The regulation had the purpose of 'protecting participants ... either from terrorist enemies or from protestors.'" Those are the words of the Ombudsman, Hansard, December 8, 2010. This was after his report.

Well, one thing about André Marin, he is extremely thorough. He's a fair man and he will say something nice about this government, even if it only uses up one paragraph on one page of a gazillion-page report here. It looks like about 120 pages. But let me read some of the other things that André Marin said in his report. You know the report I'm talking about: the report that was called Caught in the Act. That doesn't sound like the title would lead you to believe that he's going to be praising the government, does it, Mr. Speaker?

0940

**Mr. Rob Leone:** Can you judge a book by its cover, Yak?

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Pardon me? Oh, yeah.

"Regulation 233/10, passed"—this is his executive summary—"to enhance security during the G20 summit, should never have been enacted." We all know the meaning of that word, "never," eh? "It was likely unconstitutional. The effect of regulation 233/10, now expired, was to infringe on freedom of expression in ways that do not seem justifiable in a free and democratic society. Specifically, the passage of the regulation triggered the extravagant police authority found in the Public Works Protection Act, including the power to arbitrarily arrest and detain people and to engage in unreasonable searches and seizures. Even apart from the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the legality of regulation 233/10 is doubtful. The Public Works Protection Act under which it was proclaimed authorizes regulations to be created to protect infrastructure, not to provide security to people during

events. Regulation 233/10 was therefore probably invalid for having exceeded the authority of the enactment under which it was passed. These problems should have been apparent"—should have been apparent.

I asked you about the word "never"; you understand the meaning of "never." Certainly you also understand the word "apparent." It shouldn't have been difficult to understand.

"And given the tremendous power regulation 233/10 conferred on the police, sober and considered reflection should have been given to whether it was appropriate to arm officers with such authority. This was not done. The decision of"—the decision of, I repeat, so we all know who's at fault here—"the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services to sponsor the regulation was unreasonable." That is paragraph or section 1, or whatever we want to call it, of the executive summary. It goes on to well over 122, 123, and each and every one of them is a scathing indictment of this government.

Number 9: Well, it goes more about the history, which I've talked about.

Number 10: "In fact, regulation 233/10 was of doubtful constitutional validity. By creating security zones to bar entry and by authorizing arrest, it imposed definite limits on freedom of expression. It was therefore in *prima facie* violation of the charter as a matter of law, likely in ways that are not constitutionally justifiable. Regulation 233/10 worked to trip the powers of the Public Works Protection Act, thereby enabling the arrest and muting of protesters and others who had done nothing wrong. The impact of regulation 233/10 on freedom of expression was therefore almost certainly disproportionate." We know the understanding and meaning of that word, too: "disproportionate." "The government should have been wary of relying on a statute of doubtful constitutional validity in preference to dealing openly"—openly—"with the matter in the Legislature."

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Could the members on the government side take their discussion outside? It's getting a little loud over there. Thank you.

**Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield:** Not any louder than you.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** I don't need any additional comments. Thank you.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Speaker, am I being too loud for them over there? I heard a comment that I'm being too loud.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Well, I do believe you have the floor.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** I thought I did. Are we putting a volume control in this place, now? Because you know, I try to speak softly and they don't listen. I raise the volume and they don't listen. I shout and they don't listen. Maybe I will speak softly, because at least when I speak softly, tomorrow I'll probably be able to speak. Today I might wear myself out.

But it gets so frustrating, Speaker. You know, you have to ask yourself: They hear what I'm saying, regardless of the volume, because I understand these little gad-

gets here. If I speak quietly, it sounds the same. They still hear me. If you're watching on television, it's technology. I could be just barely whispering, and on the television, we all sound the same. We all sound the same. But I'll tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker: We might sound the same on the television, but we ain't saying the same thing, whether we're on the television or whether we're in here.

I want to go back because I was—and you did the right thing, and I thank you for that, for quieting down that protest over there. But I want to go back to the final sentence of number 10 here in the executive summary: "The government should have been wary of relying on a statute of doubtful constitutional validity in preference"—which means, of course, that they would rather do it that way than do it this way—"to dealing openly with the matter in the Legislature." Right here, that's where we are.

Listen, they can try to talk their way out of this thing a thousand ways to Sunday. There is no getting out of this. Are they enacting the legislation that was asked for by the Ombudsman? Yes. Are they following the recommendations of the McMurtry report? Yes. Sorry, the McMurtry report asked for the legislation; the Ombudsman's recommendations are a little different, but they are abiding by them. Why? Because they were caught in the act. But where's the penalty? Who has paid the price? Who has paid the price?

And then they—oh, this is a good one here. The minister's response, oh, that contrite minister—where was that? I've got it here somewhere, Speaker. Oh, yes. The minister's response: On November 1, 2010, the minister responded, agreeing that, "The ministry could have, and should have, handled the enactment of regulation 233/10 better" and noting that in future it would "take greater care to ensure that the Ontario public is given more adequate notice of regulation changes of this nature."

God, if I had a dollar for every criminal who went to jail and said he was sorry, eh? But you know what, Mr. Speaker? They went to jail.

No jail, no time in the penalty box, no firing. Why? Because that is the mindset of McGuinty: Hide it, run, go on vacation, hope it goes away, and invent something yourself. Invent something to change the channel: a new story, smokescreens, cover-ups—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Two comments: You might want to withdraw that one part of that statement.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Withdrawn.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Thank you. And the other one: I will remind members that when they come into this chamber, they are to acknowledge the Chair when they come and go. I saw three members in a row just walk directly to their seats—unacceptable. Thank you.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, when our kids were young, and they were heading outside, and it was cold and windy, we always reminded them to cover up.

So what did go on over there? Why was this Legislature shut out? And by extension, the people of Ontario were shut out. It's the disrespect shown to the people of Ontario.

I'm not worried what they think of me over there, Speaker. I know my honourable colleagues are not worried what the Premier thinks of them personally. But they're here for a reason: to represent the good people of their ridings. So when you disrespect the members, you disrespect the people they represent. That's got to stop.

**0950**

But it's always looking for a scapegoat. The Premier was not looking for scapegoats yesterday. You know, Mr. Speaker, we are in one heck of a mess here in this province.

**Mr. Rob Leone:** It's terrible.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** It's a terrible mess, and so much of it has been brought on by the economic decisions of this government.

So yesterday—the Premier is now blaming Ontario's mess on Alberta's success. It's always somebody else. When it was the G20, you know, “The police wanted this.” The police didn't ask for this specifically. They asked for some help, and this is what they gave them.

There's an editorial in the Ottawa Citizen. I have it in my notes here somewhere, but you know me; I'll never find it. But here is the McGuinty formula for righting the Ontario economy: “Could we just get Canada to devalue our dollar? And everything will be fine.” That's the economic policy of this Premier: Let's devalue the dollar, and everything will be fine. And he blames the devalued dollar on Alberta's success with oil extraction from the oil sands. This is how this mind thinks: “Let's damn Alberta and hope that Ontario prospers.”

Do you know that there are far more jobs being created in Ontario as a result of the economic boom in Alberta than there ever will be with his green energy jobs, ever? And I'll tell you one thing: Those jobs being created in Alberta? They don't cost us jobs, unlike high hydro rates that cost us jobs. And what drives up hydro rates more than expensive energy experiments?

So this is his answer now, because you see, he's so deeply aligned and there's been so much—oh, there have been some favours too. Let's face it, Mr. Speaker. “You scratch my back; I scratch yours. We have a fundraiser on such-and-such a day. Nice to see you there. Bring your chequebook”—

**Ms. Elizabeth Witmer:** Only \$5,000.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** —“\$5,000 a head. Come and see the Premier. He's going to pop up that day.” He's like Whac-A-Mole: There he is; there he's not. Today, the Premier shows his face, because there's money on the table. Boink—gone.

So there's a lot of money at stake. There's a lot of money at stake in his Green Energy Act and his exorbitant FIT program, so he wants to make sure his friends are happy. So what does he do? He condemns the province of Alberta.

You know, when things are going on, when things are booming in Alberta, the manufacturing sector of Ontario benefits. In fact, there was a small positive blip in manufacturing last month, and you know what it's due to? The Alberta economy. Their demands on our manufacturing have increased. But he is so myopic and so unbelievably—it's just this is his way that he thinks, and that's it. It doesn't matter what's right or wrong anymore. That he must condemn—he's, like, killing the goose that lays the golden eggs because it doesn't fit with his political philosophy. It doesn't match his plans for his legacy. This is what's going on: Let's dump on Alberta because we're hurting. Man, oh, man; it's so sad. It's so sad.

I'll tell you, the Ontario of old would never have stooped to that kind of rhetoric. It would have pulled itself up by the bootstraps. It would have enacted policies that bring this economy on the upswing. It would have done some things that make sure that this economy would continue to lead. It wouldn't go whining. You know what they called him in the Ottawa Citizen? “The whiner of Confederation.” That's what they called him, because now it's, “Oh, look at me in Ontario. It's not going good. It must be your fault.”

There are so many forces at play that have driven the Canadian dollar up. Number one is the weakness of the American dollar. Every dollar's tied—did you ever notice that every currency in the world is pegged relative to the American dollar? They're not pegged to one another. The value of every currency is pegged to the American dollar, so the weakness in the American dollar has caused our dollar to rise.

But you know what? I haven't seen them in Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, Manitoba, British Columbia or anywhere else crying about Alberta. But that's what we've sunk to here in Ontario under the leadership of this Premier, Dalton McGuinty. That's what we've sunk to. It's an embarrassment.

I know that I'm not speaking to the bill here, Speaker, and I know you're giving me that eye. You know me; I always get back to the bill.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** He never cried about Alberta's success.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** He criticized that budget.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Order. The member from Peterborough.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** The member for Peterborough, he was one of those guys at the table. I think I read his name in there. The member for Peterborough was at that cabinet meeting. He's sitting here in the House and he's worried about what I'm saying about Alberta? Your mouth was shut. His mouth was shut when they passed 233/10. He should have opened his mouth then.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** We just want to make sure the record's right here.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** This will be my last warning to the member from Peterborough. Thank you.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I do have much to get in here yet and I'm run-

ning out of time. Unless there's unanimous consent to allow me to go on, my time is going to run out here shortly.

You know me. I don't take this place personally. I like the member for Peterborough, but if he's going to sit there and be critical, then I think it's time for him—we're going to have questions and comments after this. You know how this place works, folks. After I speak, we have questions and comments. The member for Peterborough will have two minutes to stand up and make questions and comments.

This is on Bill 34. This is about 233/10. I stand here and I admonish him and I ask him: Stand in your place and you tell me and you tell 100,000 people in Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke and you tell 13 million people in Ontario why you never said a word when you were there in the passing of that regulation. You want to stand up and talk about this bill? Say why you never said a word. There's your opportunity.

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** This is bullying.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member for Orléans.

**Mr. John Yakubuski:** So, Mr. Speaker, let's get back to the meat of the matter. It will always be what we need to talk about when we're talking about this piece of legislation. Do you really think the backbench MPPs, those who weren't at the meeting as members of the Management Board of Cabinet—do you think the backbench members of the Liberal government would have agreed to this? I say no.

**Mr. Rob E. Milligan:** The member for Kingston and the Islands.

**Mr. John Yakubuski:** Well, he was there. Be careful.

They would not have because they would have looked at this and they would have asked themselves: "How can we, as members of this Legislature—we're the defenders of democracy. That's why we're here. We're here to speak for the people. How could we possibly support what they did?"

And I know that the members on this side of the House and my friends in the third party—by the way, there's nine more members of the third party. Is it nine new members of the third party? That should say something to the government on the other side. There are 16 new members in our party and there are nine new members in the third party.

But even in 2010, I am absolutely certain that the members of the third party would not have supported this. And I guarantee you that the members of this party would not have supported it. So the government the way it is, the way it whips its members, the way they're given their speaking notes and told what to say, the way they have no freedom—they walk into this House and it's like they slip the disk in the back and that's their comments for the day, because they're told exactly what to do by the cabinet.

1000

So it probably still would have passed. But you know what? No, it wouldn't have passed, because then the light of day would have been shone on it. Then the press—

even though the press likes those guys, they don't like what they did there—would have said no. The people who represent people in this province who don't sit here would have stood up and said no. The legal community would have said no.

I have a thing from a lawyer here—comments from a lawyer. Boy, she just ripped them on it. But I am running out of time. I can't believe how fast the time goes. Have you sped up the clock here? Anyway, members of the legal community would have gone AWOL. They would have gone—what's that word they use now with this YouTube stuff? Viral. It would have gone viral. It would not have passed.

So my question is, if you believe that something would not pass the judgment of the people in front of the door, why would you pass it behind the door? If it was wrong behind the door, it's wrong in front of the door, behind the door, beside the door, and it's wrong in the basement.

This never should have happened. It is an absolutely disgrace. The Ombudsman's report is an indictment of this government. Resignations should have taken place. It is not good enough to have a report months later that says we should have done better. People need to pay the price. The people of Ontario deserve better.

Now, I've got to calm down before I get a call from my cardiologist. You know, holy jumping. But, you know, it's hard. Listen, I look at the faces over there, and they're people I chat with at lunch and I meet them in the hall. They're good people. Why did you let yourselves get led down the garden path by your leadership? Why did you do it? I just don't understand it.

We can do better. We are better. We can do better; we must do better; we will do better. Thank you very much.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Michael Prue:** I rise to commend the member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke. He, for an hour, kept us all captivated. He started out by giving a historical analysis—which, I must admit, I was wondering why he was talking about the Second World War, about the sacrifices, about Hitler marching into Poland and everything else. But he drew it all together. He drew it all together when he started to talk about this legislation and why it's before this House. And he's absolutely right: It is before this House because the cabinet was culpable. The cabinet and the hangers-on who sat around that table could have stood up for the civil liberties of the people of Ontario, but did not. The cabinet and the hangers-on could have done the right thing, but they did not voice it. They kept it secret.

This member is absolutely right when he talks about the place for this to have been debated was in the Legislature. It was not, and the people of Ontario and the people in this Legislature had no idea what was going to happen. We know that hundreds and hundreds of people were arrested. We know that for almost all of them, the charges have been dismissed. We know what Roy McMurtry and what the Ombudsman had to say and every-

thing else. And you know, there it is: What he said was true.

I listened to him with great intent. I have to tell you that he gave a glimmer of hope to the people of Toronto as well when he talked about the amalgamation, when he talked about maybe one day giving us back our city, when he talked about maybe undoing what was wrong and getting East York back, as well as, I'm sure, York, Scarborough, North York and Etobicoke as well. So I thank him for his speech and for his contribution to this debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Questions and comments?

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** It's always very entertaining to listen to the member from Renfrew, and he sure wakes everybody up first thing in the morning.

But you know, Speaker, we know that the situation, the way it developed in that particular summer, leaves a lot to be desired. As a result of that, a number of reports were done and a number of recommendations were made by the Ombudsman and by Mr. McMurtry. It's as a result of that that changes are being made. We're taking an old law that was passed many, many years ago, before the Second World War, and we're modernizing it.

If you look at the law itself—it's amazing how he didn't really talk about the act that is being implemented here. We think it's extremely important, I'm sure they would agree as well, that our courtrooms, our court facilities and our nuclear facilities are as secure as they possibly can be: courtrooms because our whole democratic system of justice depends on that, and nuclear facilities obviously speak to the tremendous dangers that are there if they are not adequately protected.

You know, I listened with great interest and with some humour to what he had to say about a whole variety of things, and the one thing I always come back to is that each and every one of us is elected here from our own constituency, and we all bring something new to the table here. I listened with great interest to a lot of the maiden speeches this year and the enthusiasm that people have about what they want to bring to this place. They're going to succeed in some places, and they're not going to succeed in other places. But the reality is, we all bring the best of intentions and goodwill to this place to make sure that Ontario remains the great place that it is, with the great quality of life that we all enjoy.

Speaker, this bill is required. We need to modernize it, and it's all about making those facilities that we depend on more secure.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Comments? Questions?

**Mr. Rob Leone:** I am pleased to stand here. I actually was watching the member for Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke in my office, and I thought I can't, for the life of me, miss this. This is the greatest entertainment that I think Ontario has seen in a long, long time. He spoke passionately, he was animated, and he was right, I think, for the most part.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that I want to address the bill for a moment. I was a university professor during

the G20 summit, when that happened. Certainly, a lot of students had a lot of concerns about the security and the overuse of power, and they questioned the legitimacy. I was teaching a political science class on the legitimate use of power that governments have, and a lot of my students were talking about a very current event at the time. I was at McMaster teaching the course. The one thing that they struggled with was this question of legitimacy and legitimate use of power.

So I'm wondering if, in the two minutes that the member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke has when he replies to our questions and comments, he could touch on some of the aspects of what he considers and how he would define the legitimate use of power, or the lack of the legitimacy in this case, on the part of that government. It's certainly something that a lot of students were concerned about at the time, and certainly a lot of citizens in the province of Ontario have a lot of concern for it as well. I hope the member, in his two minutes of closing, can touch on those points, because I think the legitimate use of power and the question of legitimacy on that is a very important question that hasn't been addressed yet.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Further questions and comments?

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** I want to thank the member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke for his intervention this morning, his entertainment. Might I suggest that after his career in this place, he consider becoming a professional entertainer in the comedy realm? He's so funny. I would suggest the name of your facility could be Yak Yak's, and I'll invest in it. It will be tremendous.

But, aside from the humour, he brings up so many relevant points—the historical perspective. He talks about his family and how his wife is a saint and has to be to put up with him, and that's of course how we all feel.

One of the things that I picked up on in his comments the most was the what-if scenario that played out in Manitoba, I believe he had said. It conjures up some ideas about what if the Liberals, what if the government had done the right thing when it came to protecting citizens and protecting civil liberties? What if they had not gone behind closed doors, had not gone under a cloak of secrecy, to ensure that the laws were transparent, to ensure that those who were enforcing security understood their responsibilities, were not given a free rein to abuse, or actually understood the parameters of this bill?

I think there was a lot of miscommunication, and I think it may have been actually designed that way. It was chaotic, undoubtedly, and put a black mark and a stain on this city and this province. It is hopeful that this bill will remedy some of the effects.

I want to thank the member again for shining a whole lot of light on this subject, and I appreciate his comments this morning.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke has two minutes to respond.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank the member for Beaches–East York, the Attorney General, the member for Cambridge

and the member for Essex for their comments. I noticed the member for Cambridge was asking me—he must think I'm the minister; he was asking me a question.

One thing I will say about the Ombudsman report—that he did question as to why this law would have been needed at all to protect the perimeter. The Public Works Protection Act, the original design of it and the reason, was to protect infrastructure. It wasn't about crowd control. It wasn't about protests. It was about protecting infrastructure under the possibility of attack. The Ombudsman questioned—and I won't find it here in my two minutes—the appropriateness of actually invoking a regulation under this act for this purpose. There's enough legislation in place today, without having invoked this act, to have given the authorities the necessary tools to work with. They may have had to enforce it in a more stringent way. But the fact of this five-metre—it was never really part of what the act was intended to do, and that was controlling the activities of your own citizens.

Again, the question is the judgment of the government, as to why they would have gone down that road when there were more appropriate statutes on the books—and still are. This hasn't changed anything. What the new bill has done is changed the parameters of which they can invoke this act. It's more restricted, but it doesn't change the fact that the government still has and has the power to control people.

*Second reading debate deemed adjourned.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Being close to 10:15, this House stands recessed until 10:30.

*The House recessed from 1013 to 1030.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** Happy Pink Shirt Day. I see all of our colleagues are in the spirit today. It's great to be here. It's obviously a big bullying day, but it's really great to have a lot of Ontario principals in attendance here today in the gallery.

On behalf of all members of the assembly, I'd like to recognize the following members of the Ontario Principals' Council who are joining us today: of course, our principal in name and our Speaker, Mr. Levac, you were a principal; Vicki Shannon is here today; John Hamilton; Anne Presley; Richard Pincombe; Sharon Bowes; and Laura Hyde. They are here today to meet with members of the assembly as Ontario principals.

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** I'd like to welcome Michele Gallant, who's visiting here from Halifax today, and to also acknowledge all of the Ontario principals who are here today to meet with us to talk about the important issues in education.

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Speaker, I'd like to welcome two young people to the Legislature today, both grade 12 students at Newmarket High School: Kelsey Chisamore Johnston and her friend Connor Buott. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** I'd like to welcome Gwen Chapman and the Canadian Black Caucus, who are here today for their annual Inspiring Youth political Black History Month event.

I wish to recognize some of the schools that are participating here at the Legislative Assembly today: C.E. Webster public school, Westview Centennial Secondary, Shiloh Christian Institute and the Crawford Adventist Academy.

The event is sponsored by Dr. Anthony Sterling, Scotiabank, Diners Corner, the ONE Initiative and Lawrence Kerr Photography. The event today is being held in room 230, but the students will be walking around the Legislative Assembly. I invite all members to say hello and visit room 230 to wish them all the best.

**Ms. Sylvia Jones:** Please join me in welcoming Donna and Jeremy Williams, who are here to monitor their son, Patrick, who is the page captain today.

**Mr. John O'Toole:** I would like to welcome the students from Greenbank public school, grades 4, 5 and 6, and one of their teachers, Simone Clarkson. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Mr. Jim McDonell:** I'd like to welcome the family of Ryan Haley, one of our pages: his mother, Joanne Haley, and some of his family. Welcome to the Legislature.

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** I'd like to welcome a number of our guests who are members of the Ontario Principals' Council on this their Queen's Park day. Please join me in welcoming Ian McFarlane, Naeem Siddiq, Ken Arnott, Susan Ferguson, Bob Pratt and Peggy Sweeny. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Mr. Frank Klees:** I want to extend a special welcome to Ken Arnott, who is the principal at Northern Lights Public School in Aurora. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Mrs. Laura Albanese:** I would like to welcome to Queen's Park the students and teachers from C.E. Webster elementary school, from the great riding of York South-Weston. They are here for the Inspiring Youth Black History Month event.

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** I'm very pleased to introduce today Mr. Sean Hebel and his son Ryan, who is a student at Rockway Mennonite school. They're going to be joining us for a tour and lunch in this session.

**Mr. Monte McNaughton:** I'd like to introduce Susan Ferguson, who is a principal at North Lambton Secondary School in Lambton-Kent-Middlesex. Welcome, Susan.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### TAXATION

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** My question is for the Premier. For years, Premier, you have stood in this House and acknowledged that business tax cuts create jobs and are good for the economy, yet you've decided to hike taxes on the very people who Ontario depends on to get us out

of this recession: job creators. Premier, will you today do the right thing and vote with the Ontario PC caucus to stop your tax hike on job creators?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, the member is right: We have in fact cut corporate taxes quite dramatically. We have eliminated the capital tax—and they voted against all those tax cuts. We've taken the general corporate rate from 14% to 11.5% and the manufacturing process from 12% to 10%. And I remember the last Conservative budget here in Ontario, when the then Minister of Finance raised corporate taxes, Mr. Speaker.

We will look at this in the context of the entire budget and make the right choices that are balanced for all Ontarians.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** I find it amazing that the finance minister congratulates his government for the great job that they're doing when their own economist says that the deficit is going to \$30 billion by 2017-18.

You have spent months dodging even the most basic questions about business tax cuts, and in that time Ontario has lost far too many businesses that have moved out of our province to create jobs somewhere else. You cannot dodge much longer. Later today you will finally have to put your money, as it were, where your mouth is. Business leaders everywhere will be interested in seeing if you really will take the disastrous step of raising taxes on Ontario businesses.

Minister, will you actually be at the vote this afternoon? Will the Premier be there? Or are you both too embarrassed at your climb-down on business taxes to even show up?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** I'd like to read from Hansard a quote from Janet Ecker, the then Conservative finance minister, dated June 17, 2002—and I know you were there, you were there, you were there, you were there and you were there. Here's what she said:

"In the meantime, because of our short-term fiscal situation, I will introduce legislation to delay ... the current planned reductions in personal and corporate income tax and the next step of the equity in education tax credit."

Mr. Speaker, we have to make a variety of choices to continue to build on this great province's future. It's about good education; it's about good health care; it's about a competitive tax system, which we have now, Mr. Speaker.

We welcome their bluster. We want to hear their motion. I know all the members will cast their votes, free to vote the way they choose. They will make those choices. We're proud of our members and proud of this great province.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** Great, great speech-making, Minister, but I could spend all day reminding you of your own commitment to cut taxes to create jobs: another commitment you are backtracking on. Since I don't have

all day, we will save discussing your complete reversal for the next election campaign, when, thanks to your tax hikes on job creators, we will no doubt still be in a jobs crisis.

Minister, you may not have any intention of running in the next election or you may. You might even want to be leader in the next election; we don't know what your Premier is going to do. But some of the folks on that side of the House are going to be there. How are they going to look their local business leaders in the face after you once again have turned your back on the small business community?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, they'll look at the small business community and say, "We cut your taxes, we made your environment more competitive, and my Conservative opponent voted against that." That's what they'll say.

They'll speak of integrity. They'll ask whether or not full-day learning should be a priority over the horse racing industry. They'll ask whether or not corporate tax cuts, when we now have a low and competitive rate, should have greater importance than—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Bring it down, please.

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, they will ask why that party would see further corporate tax cuts as a priority over class size.

Those are important priorities. That's what the budget process is about. We're being clear with our priorities; they're saying corporate tax cuts are more important than education. We simply don't share that point of view.

1040

## TAXATION

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** Back to the Premier, Speaker: Premier, the NDP have been wrong on business tax cuts ever since there was a business to tax. While the Ontario PC caucus disagrees with the NDP on that, we at least respect the NDP for being principled.

That same thing cannot be said about your government. You and your government have a track record as reliable as the sunrise of breaking promises and backing away from your commitments.

Premier, you have a chance to break that pattern today. The question is, will you? Will you do what is right? Will you keep your commitment and vote with the Ontario PC caucus to reduce taxes on job creators?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member opposite thought that his own finance minister lacked principles when she made the choices she made—and that was the first budget after the Taxpayer Protection Act, which they put into place, and then the first thing they do is vote against their own legislation. I thought that was a principled stand in a difficult time.

I regret that you would accuse your colleagues in your own caucus, your former finance minister, your former

Premier of being unprincipled. I think they are principled people. I disagreed with them on many issues. It's a shame that they tie principle and integrity into this debate. Principle and integrity are very important in public policy and very important in politics.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** This finance minister talks about principle while this province sustains an unemployment rate of 8.1%.

You spent the last election campaign attacking the NDP as job killers and incompetent on the economy, but if you vote against the Ontario PC motion today, you yourself will kill more jobs and prove yourself incompetent on the economy. You will lose what little credibility you had left with business leaders in Ontario.

Perhaps it's time for a new finance minister, and maybe you can take the health minister with you. Go home. Go home with a shred of integrity intact. Vote for the Ontario PC motion today. I ask you again, will you commit to doing that?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** I would like to quote from one Jim Flaherty in 2003, and I know members opposite have a lot of connections with Mr. Flaherty. Here's what he said in response to when the Tories delayed their planned tax cut: "The delay was created by a financial downturn related to ... 'extraordinary circumstances' ...."

I think Mr. Flaherty has principle and integrity. I think your colleagues there have principle and integrity. I may not agree with them. I think principle and integrity are important to politics. And I can assure you, not only am I and the Minister of Health staying here, we're going to fight for a better Ontario for our kids and for the rest of the people of this great province.

*Applause.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Stop the clock. Be seated.

Final supplementary.

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** As far as I'm concerned and our party's concerned, they've just given a round of applause to a finance minister who has presided over a deficit that's larger than all other provinces' combined.

Speaker, Ontarians elected 16 new Ontario PC caucus members. Ontarians want us—want us—to fight for the jobs that are fleeing this province. We are going to spend each and every day of this Legislature doing exactly that.

If you hike taxes on job creators, Ontarians will not let you forget it. We on this side of the House will not let you forget it. Every time a business closes its doors, we will remind you. Every day that Ontario falls further behind the rest of Canada, we will remind you. And every day of the next election campaign, we will remind you.

It is not too late. Premier, finance minister: Will you do what's right? Will you vote with us today?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Minister?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Be seated, please. Thank you. Minister?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, there is one government in Canada that has a larger deficit than Ontario. That's the federal Conservative government in Ottawa, and we worked with them to stimulate the economy.

*Interjections.*

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** The members opposite want to laugh. I don't think it's a laughing matter any more than I think that the tactics of the president of the PC Party with respect to Irwin Cotler are a laughing matter.

If you want to speak to integrity and principle in politics, I wonder, given what the Speaker said about those tactics—here is what the Speaker of the federal House said: "Attempting to sow confusion in the minds of voters as to whether or not their member was about to resign was a reprehensible tactic...."

Mr. Speaker, let's hear what they have to say about integrity in politics. Let's find out where they really stand on integrity.

## TAXATION

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, my question is for the Premier. Last December, the Minister of Finance voted to defeat my private member's motion cancelling the corporate tax giveaways planned for this year and next. A motion on the same topic, as we've just heard, is scheduled for later today, but with the opposite intention in mind.

Can the Premier say how he plans to vote on this afternoon's motion?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** It's good to be wanted, Speaker. It's good to be wanted. I get the sense, though, that we're getting conflicting advice on this particular issue.

We will do everything that we need to do to continue to be informed by the values that shape us as Ontarians. We want a strong economy, we want great schools, and we want great health care. We want our kids—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order. Member from Renfrew, come to order.

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** This is unfair, Speaker. This is unfair.

We'll continue to bring a balanced and thoughtful approach to the choices that we make.

I know that we have—in 2008, we cut capital taxes. We raised the small business tax exemption. In 2009, we enhanced tax credits for businesses to hire apprentices and the like.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, during the last election campaign, New Democrats argued that Stephen-Harper-style corporate tax giveaways were not working in Ontario. The minister and the Premier said the sky was going to fall without them.

Is the Premier ready to admit that the Liberal election rhetoric about the importance of these corporate tax giveaways was wrong, or will he be voting with the Conservatives in favour of their motion this afternoon?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** We look forward to the debate to be held in this very chamber this afternoon, and we look forward to the results that come from that.

What I can say is that we have moved aggressively in the past with respect to improving the competitiveness of the tax environment here in Ontario for our businesses. As I was saying, in 2008, we cut the capital tax rate by 21%. That was retroactive to January 1. We subsequently eliminated all capital taxes. In 2008, we raised the small business tax exemption 25%. In 2009, we enhanced tax credits for businesses that hire apprentices. Also in 2009, we extended the Ontario innovation tax credit. In 2010, we adopted the HST. In 2010, we cut the corporate income tax rate from 14% to 12%. So I think we have done a great deal here on this side of the House to ensure we have a competitive tax environment in Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** The Premier has spoken previously about difficult choices, but in this situation, I think it's pretty much a no-brainer, and it really shows how out of touch the government is with the challenges that are facing everyday families.

But you know what? This is only one example. Beginning in 2015, this government is going to start allowing Ontario's richest corporations to write off expenses like entertainment, like travel, like gasoline. This is yet another drain on a treasury that simply cannot afford it.

Does the Premier plan to defend this giveaway as well?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, they can already do those things.

I'd also remind my colleague, as she tries to pigeon-hole various political leaders, to take a look at what President Obama just did. He made a commitment to further cut their corporate taxes, and I will say that even if those commitments are ultimately honoured by the various Houses down there through their process, our taxes will still be more competitive.

Speaker, I remind my honourable colleague of something I said just earlier today, informed in part by advice that she offered during the course of the campaign. At a time when we've got to make important choices and difficult choices, I think we've got to look at the corporate tax measures that are available through boxes at entertainment events and sporting events. I think it's something we've got to take a very close look at.

1050

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My next question is to the Minister of Health. The minister has insisted that she has had no power to look into Ornge's strange financial schemes, but schedule K of the performance agreement between the province and Ornge makes it clear that Ornge had to submit a budget to the ministry every July, an audited statement every July and quarterly expenditure

reports. Did none of these many reports twig the minister that something might be amiss?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you for the question. As the member opposite well knows, there have been serious irregularities at Ornge. That is why we have taken the action we have to fix the problems that exist now and to ensure that these problems do not happen again.

I can assure the member opposite that my ministry officials exercised as much power as they had to try to get answers from Ornge on a range of issues. I can tell you also that those requests for information were not met with the kind of collaboration and respect that one would expect from a partner delivering care.

It was not just the ministry that had trouble accessing information. The Auditor General of Ontario was unable to get the information he needed. That is why we have taken the action we have, and that is why we are moving forward with new leadership.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** It begs the question, who the heck is running the ship in Ontario with that kind of response?

In December 2010, New Democrat MPPs raised issues about Ornge in committee. The minister said she would get to the bottom of it. By December 2011, she should have seen four quarterly reports, an annual report and an audited statement. Did none of these many reports lead the minister to believe that something might be wrong at Ornge?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** The answer to that is yes, and that is why we have taken the action we have. We have gone through the appropriate steps. We eventually got to the point where we had to take what is almost unprecedented action. We sent in a forensic audit team. We fired the CEO and replaced the CEO with a new interim CEO. We fired the board and have replaced them with a very highly competent board.

We are developing a new performance agreement that will have embedded in it the measures that I think the people of this province expect us to have in terms of oversight at Ornge. I will be introducing legislation shortly that will bring the force of law to those elements of the performance agreement.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Another schedule to the agreement, which—she obviously failed in the first place in terms of preparation of the original one. But in that original one, it states that the ministry had a right to enter Ornge's offices to view and copy financial records, invoices and documents and to conduct an audit.

In 2010, the minister insisted she was going to get to the bottom and get answers to the questions about Ornge. Months later—months later—when she was asked about Ornge in this House, she made the same reply and promises again: that she would get to the bottom of it.

Can the minister explain how it is that she was stonewalled for over a year, even though she had the power to

walk into Ornge offices, order an audit and look at any financial documentation she wanted to?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** The people of this province expect me to fix the problems as we found them. We found serious problems at Ornge. That is why we have taken the quite extraordinary actions that we have taken.

We are moving forward with a new performance agreement because the old one simply does not reflect the degree of transparency and accountability that I and my government feel is appropriate. We are moving forward with the new board. I told the new board to focus, first, on patient safety. That was the most important thing. The second most important thing was to address the financial irregularities, and that work is under way right now.

The other piece that the new board is responsible for is for winding down all the for-profit entities that were created under the previous management that clearly was not up to the job.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. The minister boasts of a new leadership team at Ornge, and yet the two individuals who were responsible for implementing the very policies that undermined patient care at Ornge are still there. Yesterday, I asked the minister how these two have managed to negotiate their immunity. Now that she's had an opportunity to look into this, I wonder if the minister could enlighten us as to how and why Mr. Rick Potter and Mr. Steve Farquhar are still there?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, the responsibility that I take very, very seriously is to put in place a new board of directors who are exercising the authority that they have been entrusted with in a very energetic and deliberate way.

The new chair of the board is Ian Delaney, a former chair of Sherritt International, a highly respected Canadian and international business person. Charles Harnick, a former member of this Legislature, is on the board. Patricia Lang, the former president of Confederation College; Dr. Barry McLellan, the CEO at Sunnybrook Hospital—impeccable credentials. Maneesh Mehta, the co-founder of the Black Box Institute, a member of the local health integration network, is on this board; Patrice Merrin; Patricia Volker—these are very highly skilled individuals who have volunteered to come to the aid—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you, Minister. Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Well, perhaps we can help the minister. A background check of the new board reveals some interesting relationships. I have a media release dated May 26, 2010, announcing a \$250,000 donation to Confederation College by none other than Dr. Chris Mazza. The cheque was accepted by Patricia Lang, who was then president of Confederation College and is now one of the new board members. And no doubt, it's just a coincidence that Mr. Rick Potter happened to be employed by Confederation College.

Could it be possible that Mr. Potter still has his job because of those relationships?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, the member opposite has impugned the integrity of some very impressive people. The reputation of the board of directors of Ornge should not be questioned by the member opposite. If he wants to throw mud, he can throw it in my direction. Do not throw it at the people who have come to get Ornge back on track. Do not throw mud at the front-line staff who are working so hard to deliver air service in this province. Shame on the member opposite.

#### Interjections.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order. Order. I appreciate the fact that you have come to order as quickly as I asked. I appreciate that. I would also appreciate not having to have me stand in the first place. That would be very helpful. It is a difficult situation, and I do want to hear everyone, so it's fair that everyone be heard. So I'd ask again, don't make me respond, by allowing the questions and answers to be given. Thank you so much.

**Mr. Frank Klees:** On a point of order, Speaker: Will the minister resign?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member knows that's not a point of order, and it has not been helpful right when we were complimenting you for not inflaming the situation. I would ask that the minister finish her answer—thank you.

New question.

1100

#### TAXATION

**Mr. Michael Prue:** My question is to the Minister of Finance. The minister recently wrote a letter to Jim Flaherty, stating: "It is not clear that taxpayers should be subsidizing certain business expenses ... such as private boxes and corporate seats at sporting events."

But the HST agreement the minister signed with Ottawa will allow large corporations to get a sales tax rebate on those very expenses in the coming years. How come the minister wasn't concerned about these reckless giveaways when he signed the HST agreement in the first place?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is probably aware that he's speaking about two different things. He's talking about deductions for income tax purposes versus input tax credits. The input tax credits have been shown to increase business productivity, to help manage the cost of doing business in this great province.

I did write Mr. Flaherty—I think we do share some common ground on these kinds of issues. I point out to him that that is one item I raised with Mr. Flaherty: the number of things that, co-operating with the federal government, we can do to help improve the fiscal situation both for Canada and for Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Here's what Ontario's finance minister said when New Democrats proposed an end to

the HST write-off on box seats during the election campaign, and I'm quoting here from the Toronto Star of September 13, 2011: "It represents killing a huge job creation initiative."

Does that remain the minister's position? And if not, why is the province proceeding with plans to let corporations get a sales tax rebate on box seats and expensive restaurants?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, again I want to point out to the member opposite that in fact there are two spots where this happens. One is on income tax and one will be, I think six years from now, on HST input tax credits. So I think we share some common ground on these issues. I look forward to the points of view put forward by the third party and I welcome the points of view put forward by the official opposition.

We'll continue to work to keep Ontario's tax system fair as we lay out a budget plan that will protect the best education system and best health care system in the world.

#### ANTI-BULLYING INITIATIVES

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** My question is for the Minister of Education. Minister, as you know, today is Pink Shirt Day. Pink Shirt Day began in Nova Scotia when a grade 9 boy wore a pink shirt to school and he was mercilessly bullied by schoolmates for looking gay.

Minister, as we all know, words can hurt. Two thirds of kids who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender feel unsafe at school. Almost three quarters of kids report hearing homosexual slurs at schools every day.

Bullying in our schools is a serious problem with devastating results. I know this is an issue that is important to all members in the House. Minister, can you please tell this House what the government is doing to combat this awful problem?

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** I want to thank the member for Ottawa Centre for his leadership, and I want to acknowledge the leadership right around the House today. I look across and I see more than 30 pink shirts and pink outfits today, and I think that exemplifies the root of what Pink Shirt Day is about.

Pink Shirt Day is about a community coming together to fight against bigotry and racism and homophobia, to say that we will fight that in a collective effort together. I certainly hope—when I look around the Legislature today, I can feel comfort that this Legislature will come together on this very important issue and continue to stand up for Ontario's kids in all their great diversities.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** Speaker, we are proud of all students who take a stand and work hard to end bullying in our schools.

In order to combat bullying in schools across this province, we need to change the culture in all of our schools. We need to make bullying socially unacceptable in our schools. There have recently been very tragic

incidents of young people taking their lives because of the fact that they were bullied in schools, and we have spoken about that in this Legislature.

I know that the Minister of Education agrees that this is completely unacceptable. Will the minister tell this House about legislation that she has introduced in order to stop bullying in our schools?

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** Again, today we take a step to show that we all, across this Legislature, care about this very important issue.

There's another opportunity coming ahead. Bill 13, the Accepting Schools Act, if passed, would create legal obligations for boards to address bullying prevention and early intervention, progressive discipline, and equity and inclusive education. It's an opportunity for us to tell all kids in Ontario that not only will it get better, but we will make it better.

I look forward to all of those in this Legislature coming together to have an opportunity to pass the Accepting Schools Act, which speaks so clearly to the fact that we want every student in every school in every part of this province to be safe and accepted every day when they come into their school and their classrooms. Together, we can make that a reality.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Good morning, Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health.

Every flight of every air ambulance service in Canada and in the United States can be tracked on several websites across the continent. Can the minister tell us why Ornge has made the decision to block Ornge's Ontario air ambulance flights from these public tracking systems? Minister, what is Ornge trying to hide?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you to the member for the question. What I can tell you is that we have very strong, new leadership in place that is focused on three particular issues.

They are focused on patient safety, and they have taken steps to ensure that the patients who are transported by Ornge get the care they need when they need it.

They are focused on the financial situation at Ornge. There have been financial irregularities identified, and they are very focused on addressing those issues.

We are focused on bringing much more transparency and accountability to the work that goes on at Ornge.

We're also working on winding down the for-profits, and we are focused completely on providing care to the people of this province.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Speaker, we now know that the Thunder Bay helicopters have been out of service for a total of 46,716 minutes so far this year. That equals 32 days with no pilot or paramedic available. And because Ornge is not willing to station a full complement of staff in Sioux Lookout, we have discovered that they are using air ambulances hidden from tracking systems to shuttle paramedics to and from Thunder Bay.

Minister, we're not getting any answers. You seem to be doing this on the fly, but now people's lives are at stake. Will you please step down?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I would be very happy to share with this House some information about Ornge that is actually based in fact.

Yesterday, Ornge pilots flew for 94 hours; they covered over 20,000 statute miles. They arrived on the scene in two situations; they transferred 57 patients. Between November and January, they travelled more than 1.3 million statute miles.

The people at Ornge are doing their job. I have every confidence in the new leadership. Were there problems at Ornge? Absolutely. Are they being addressed? Absolutely. Are we seeing progress? Yes. Are the front-line staff seeing the difference that the new management is bringing? Yes.

### CHILD CARE

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** My question to the Minister of Education: What does the minister suggest members of this House tell parents who come to them with the information that their child care centre is being closed because of the poor implementation of all-day kindergarten?

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** I'm pleased to stand and talk about the single largest investment that we're making in early learning. All-day kindergarten, when fully invested, will be \$1.5 billion. Each year, we respond to families who ask us, "When can my child be in all-day kindergarten?"

1110

Despite challenging fiscal times, we've made a determination that we will move forward with all-day kindergarten because it is in the best interest of all of our children to gain that early learning. I can tell you that I've had a chance to speak to the member opposite about the work that we're doing to make sure that we modernize and transform child care to reflect a new reality that our four and five-year-olds will be in school. They will no longer be in child care.

So I invite the member to bring forward solutions to work with those families, as I am, and to find a new pathway forward for child care in Ontario, one that puts our earliest learners first and continues to invest in them.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** I have to tell you, I don't think parents are going to warm to that answer. Hundreds—hundreds—of child care centres in communities across Ontario have closed since 2007. Hundreds more are at risk of closing as four- and five-year-olds transition into full-day kindergarten. The minister has made it clear that investments in early learning are a priority and that full-day kindergarten will not be cut. So be it. Not a bad idea. Will she also assure parents of younger children that their child care centres will be there for them?

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** Speaker, I think it's important, as we talk about the investments that this govern-

ment has made to improve the lives of children, that we focus on the fact that our government, since 2003, has increased child care funding from \$532 million to \$869 million, a 63% increase. When the federal Conservative government stepped away from child care, we stepped forward and we invested an additional \$63.5 million. So I can tell you, we have been focused on child care. We have been focused on looking for solutions, and we invite all members of this House to work with our government and with families in this province to acknowledge what will be a new reality come 2014.

Four- and five-year-olds will be in all-day kindergarten. That's where they should be. Will we continue to support child care in this province? Will we continue to invest in it? Of course we could. I've invited the member opposite to give me his advice. I look forward to that advice.

### HEALTH CARE

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** This question is for the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. Minister, there are two big challenges that we need to face right now in health care. The first challenge is fiscal: Ontario has a \$16-billion budget shortfall and health care is 42% of the budget.

The second challenge is demographic. The first of the baby boom generation turned 65 last year. Our generation will put ever-increasing pressure on health care. The status quo will lead to a health care system that simply can't meet patient needs. Minister, how will Ontario address this challenge facing health care?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I'd like to thank the member from Mississauga—Streetsville for this very thoughtful, astute question.

I tell you, the solution to the challenges that he has identified are vital to the future health of this province and of health care in Ontario. We have launched an action plan that builds on the progress that we have made over the past eight years. It focuses on improving the quality of patient care. It focuses on improving access, particularly primary care. It focuses on looking forward so that we shift spending from those investments that do not improve patient outcomes to those things that do. We are committed to maintaining our investment in health care, but the fiscal circumstances demand that we get smarter about how we spend our health care dollars—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** Minister, despite the challenging economic times, Ontario must deliver, protect and strengthen the health care services that we all need. Our parents' and grandparents' generations showed the courage and the compassion to create our uniquely Canadian universal health care system.

In neighbourhoods like Lisgar, Meadowvale and Streetsville in Mississauga, we need more options for seniors to get the care they need outside hospitals and long-term care. Every new dollar into the system must first, last and always improve the health of patients.

Minister, what specific measures will Ontario take to achieve this?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** We are shifting our focus to the patient by taking several steps that make our system much more patient-focused and patient-friendly than it currently is. We will create faster access to primary health care by expanding after-hours care. That will have a corresponding decrease in the pressure on our emergency departments. Bringing doctors, primary care physicians, into local planning will expand access again. Resources will be shifted into the community because we know we can provide excellent care at home, again taking pressure off our hospitals and off our long-term-care homes.

By moving routine procedures from hospitals into stand-alone, not-for-profit clinics, we can again take pressure off hospitals and provide excellent care and excellent value for the taxpayer dollars—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. John O'Toole:** My question is to the Minister of Health. Minister, for weeks, questions have been swirling around regarding the Ornge organization's neglect and mismanagement. Speaker, I have documents here from 2009 from your MPP from Durham inquiring about procurement practices at Ornge, specifically with regard to aircraft and medically designed interiors.

In a letter from 2009, the Minister of Health thanked Mr. Leal for his comments and brushed off his inquiry. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming crystal clear every day that this government was advised of growing problems and yet has failed to act. Minister, members of your own caucus were warning you of these problems from back in 2009. You knew there were business problems. You knew there were procurement problems. You knew there were patient service problems. You knew that Ornge was a rogue organization from the start.

Minister, will you accept responsibility and—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you to the member opposite for the question. I can tell you, Speaker, that we are moving forward with changes in governance to Ornge that will ensure the patients of this province get access to the highest quality air transportation and land ambulance transportation. The people of this province deserve and expect the very best, and that is why we are making the changes we have done.

As I have said, Speaker, I will shortly be introducing legislation that will have several components to it. I would like to take this opportunity to highlight some of that. It will entrench in law that the ministry has a full ability to review the finances of Ornge. It will bring a patient advocate to Ornge the way our hospitals do. It will require Ornge to have quality improvement plans, just as we have done in hospitals.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. John O'Toole:** Mr. Speaker, they're closing the barn door after the horses are gone. Mr. Speaker, in the letter I have from the member from Peterborough, the former president of Ornge stated, "We have developed a rigorous procurement process that is used to acquire high-quality goods and services at a cost-effective price." This could only be true if "rigorous process" meant their pockets were being lined with taxpayers' money under your watch.

Minister, rather than take any meaningful action to investigate these problems, you've simply looked the other way. Mr. Speaker, where there's smoke, there's fire, and there seems to be a lot of smoke coming from this minister.

So I'm asking you today, Minister, with the Premier listening: You're responsible; will you take responsibility and resign your job today? Hand in the keys.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I take my instructions from the people of this province, and what they're telling me is that they want to know that when they need air ambulance care, or when someone they love does, that that service is there for them. They also want to know that their tax dollars are being spent in the most effective manner possible. That is why I have taken the steps I have done that have involved bringing in a forensic audit team and ultimately referring the matter to the Ontario Provincial Police.

Now, I might say that the member opposite might not think that those are important and decisive steps, but I can tell you, the people of Ontario respect the changes that are happening at Ornge. They welcome the changes in Ontario, Speaker, and I continue to drive those changes.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### WORKPLACE SAFETY

**Mr. Michael Mantha:** My question is to the Premier. Jordan Fram and Jason Chenier died on the evening of June 8, 2011, when an uncontrolled torrent of wet ore material burst out of the number 7 ore pass at Vale Inco's Stobie mine and buried them. Steelworkers Local 6500 members had complained for weeks about problems in the number 7 ore pass, but the issues were not adequately addressed by management.

1120

Will the Premier direct the Minister of Labour to conduct a full and public investigation into the causes of these fatalities so that tragedies like this one won't happen again to any family?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Northern Development and Mines.

**Hon. Rick Bartolucci:** I want to thank the member for the question. I know the Minister of Labour will want to respond in the supplemental, but obviously, I think, we offer our sympathies to the Chenier family and to the

Fram family. We know that one workplace death is one death too many, and we have to ensure that we do everything within our power to ensure our workplace is safe.

We know that Vale has done an investigation and offered some recommendations. Today, we hear that the United Steelworkers have done an investigation and offered recommendations. We know that the Ministry of Labour is undergoing an investigation at this point in time.

At the end of the day, we have to ensure we have the safest possible workplaces.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**M<sup>me</sup> France G  linas:** The question is back to the Premier. We wanted to know if a full public investigation was going to take place. We got no answer.

Now, miners, mining companies and the Ministry of Labour—everybody involved with health and safety—have long recognized that issues associated with ore passes are some of the most hazardous conditions in underground mining, which is already a dangerous environment. An ore pass, Premier, is what allows miners to move the ore from the upper level of the mine to the bottom so it can be brought back to surface.

The tragedy of those two deaths is that the mining companies know how to prevent those incidents from becoming accidents; it's a matter of taking action. So will the Premier, on behalf of Jordan Fram's mother and sister, who are here with us today; on behalf of Jason Chenier's widow and family, ask the Attorney General and his assistant deputy Attorney General responsible for criminal law to lay charges under the Westray provisions of the Criminal Code?

**Hon. Rick Bartolucci:** To the Minister of Labour.

**Hon. Linda Jeffrey:** I too would like to offer my condolences to the families and their co-workers who were killed in this tragic incident. No one in our province should be able to go to work unsure that they will return safely at the end of the day. That's why my ministry is committed to improving health and safety in Ontario mines and workplaces across Ontario.

The Ministry of Labour's investigation is ongoing. It would be inappropriate for me to comment on the specifics of this case. What I can say is that our investigators have been working on this case since day one, and their investigation will be thorough and comprehensive. It's what the family members of the deceased would want and expect, and that's what we are going to do.

## JUSTICE SYSTEM

**Mr. Bas Balkissoon:** My question is for the Attorney General. Minister, in 2008, your ministry launched the Justice on Target program, aimed at reducing delays in the criminal justice system. I understand that every year, for nearly 20 years, the number of appearances it took to resolve a criminal case went up. By 2008, the number of court appearances and the duration it took to resolve a criminal matter had increased considerably. I understand that every criminal court of the Ontario justice system is

identifying, implementing and sustaining initiatives to tackle this delay.

Minister, after four years of work, can you tell this House what progress has been made with the Justice on Target system to reduce the trend of criminal court—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Question?

Attorney General.

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** Well, thank you very much, Speaker. First of all, I thank the member for the question. Yes, the strategy is working, and as a result of the action we took and my predecessor took some four years ago, we have reversed the trend and the number of court appearances are indeed down. We've set aggressive goals, and those goals inspired aggressive innovation in each and every courthouse. In fact, the number of appearances to resolve a criminal case is almost 25% lower than it would have been if we had taken no action at all.

Two thirds of Ontario's criminal courts have reduced the average number of appearances since the strategy has come into effect, and 16 sites—16 courts—have achieved double-digit reductions.

There have been nearly half a million fewer court appearances since JOT began, but it requires the collaboration of everyone that's involved in the court system, from the judges to the crown attorneys to the defence counsel and, indeed, to all the other support workers.

It is working. There's more work to be done, Speaker.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Bas Balkissoon:** Thank you, Minister. Good to hear that we're making progress.

Many people at the local level are involved in working towards local targets, and they should be commended. My constituents in Scarborough—Rouge River are interested in what this means for them on the ground at the local level and at their local courthouses.

I understand that for the first time ever, criminal court statistics dating back to 2000 are made publicly available so that Ontarians can follow the progress of courts in their local community towards reaching their targets.

Minister, can you provide me with some examples as to how this benefits everyday Ontarians accessing our justice system?

**Hon. John Gerretsen:** I thank you for the supplementary as well.

I can highlight an example from a courthouse where people who come to the court for the first time and have questions are handed a sheet as to what actions they should take. This didn't always happen before that.

Last week, I attended the Etobicoke courthouse, in which over 22,000 charges are being dealt with on an annual basis right here in Toronto. I saw the JOT team in action, and I can tell you that those folks are doing some great work.

I'm very proud of JOT. There's still a lot of work to be done. We can do better. The goals that were set were more aggressive than what we have achieved so far.

But I can also tell you that it requires the collaboration of everyone involved in the court system. We've had

great co-operation from the judges, from the JPs, from the crown prosecutors as well as the defence bar.

Speaker, we're heading the right way. The number of appearances in the criminal cases in Ontario is going down, and that's exactly what JOT had in mind when it started.

### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** My question is for the Minister of Health. Back in 2009, with the co-operation of the Sisters of St. Joseph, 30 interim long-term-care beds were opened at the Marguerite Centre in Pembroke. This was done to alleviate the pressure on the Pembroke Regional Hospital with the number of alternative-level-of-care beds. The plan worked. The hospital achieved its goal, and patients became residents at the Marguerite Centre.

Without warning, in December, you decided to close those 30 beds. This has been a great cause of concern in my community. My question is twofold: With already-long waiting lists for LTC beds, why would you close these interim beds? And will that not just ensure that the Pembroke Regional Hospital will again be converting expensive acute care beds to alternative-level-of-care beds?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you to the member opposite for this question. This is an important question because it demonstrates the change that is happening in the way we care for our elderly people.

These interim beds were created. They were called interim beds because it was always intended to be a short-term situation as we built community capacity to be able to care for people in their own homes whenever possible.

So these are interim beds. They will be closing gradually. Everyone who is a resident there now will be placed in the long-term-care home of their choice. We are doing this in a thoughtful way. At the same time, we are ramping up the services that will permit people to have the supports they need to stay home as long as possible.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Minister, the issue in the community is that there continues to be a lack of placements available. There's a lack of capacity in long-term care for these residents.

Would it not make sense to keep these beds open until the numbers on the waiting list drop? We all know that the most expensive and inappropriate care is the care they'll be getting if they end up in an ALC bed in a hospital.

My first request is that you suspend this plan until such time as a better alternative solution can be found. Failing that, can you give the people of Pembroke, and particularly the current residents of Marguerite Centre and their families, the assurance that not a single one of them will be moved out without being transferred to the long-term-care home of their choice?

1130

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I can't give the member opposite the assurance that all current residents will be moved to a long-term-care home of their choice. This is a good example of a community working together. The Champlain LHIN has been working with partners in Pembroke, including Marianhill, Pembroke Regional Hospital and the Champlain CCAC to ensure a smooth transition for the very people that the member opposite is speaking on behalf of.

So I look forward to the completion of this transition, and I very much look forward to the doubling in funding that will be focused on the assess-and-restore beds to get people back home, because you know what? That's where people want to be, if at all possible.

### OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Today is repetitive strain injury awareness day, and this morning there are injured workers at Queen's Park looking to this government for action. RSIs or musculoskeletal disorders, MSDs, account for 50% of all lost-time days and are the most common lost-time claim under the WSIB. The cost to our health care system is staggering, and so are the personal costs. Will the minister listen to these workers and finally implement the needed ergonomic regulations?

**Hon. Linda Jeffrey:** I thank the member for the question. Over the last few months, as a relatively new Minister of Labour, I have been fortunate enough to have the opportunity to hear from injured workers first-hand, and I was proud to speak with them and to share with them our commitment to treating injured workers with dignity and respect. In fact, we spoke about the fact that we've increased injured workers' benefits every year from 2007 to 2012, and on January 1, 2011, we increased benefits again. On January 1, 2012, benefits will increase again by 0.5%. That's a total increase of 9% since mid-2007.

The Workplace Safety and Insurance Board is conducting comprehensive funding reviews to ensure that the board has long-term financial stability, and we've asked that the review include options for new benefit indexation to replace the modified Friedland formula and to support fairness for injured workers.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** The minister's concerns are commendable, but what Ontario workers need is better mandatory protection. For years, this government has hoped that voluntary measures and awareness would be enough to reverse the epidemic of RSIs. Well, today, all these workers are here to tell you that it is not. They need strong regulations. I ask the minister again: Will she commit to bringing forward these essential changes today?

**Hon. Linda Jeffrey:** Mr. Speaker, the health and the safety of Ontario workers is a top priority of this government, and we continue to work with the WSIB to make

significant improvements that benefit both the workers and the employers. The WSIB has committed to the introduction of a new workplace integration program, which hired 200 new staff and repatriated thousands of cases formerly managed by private sector providers, with extremely positive outcomes in 2011. The re-employment has increased under the new program to 74% from 35% under the old program. The average length of return-to-work plans is now five months versus 19 months under the old program.

Clearly, one injury is one too many. We want to make sure that people get back to work, that we help injured workers, that we make sure there are fewer injuries in the future. Prevention is part of our mandate, and the new prevention officer, the chief prevention officer, will make that a mandate going forward.

### AIR QUALITY

**Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti:** My question is for the Minister of the Environment. Protecting the quality of the air we breathe is a fundamental concern for all Ontarians. Smog, airborne toxins and other forms of outdoor air pollution are affecting the health of thousands of individuals every year.

Speaker, through you, would the Minister of the Environment please share with us what our government is doing to help improve air quality for all Ontario residents?

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** An excellent question, I can tell the member. We're replacing dirty coal-fired plants with cleaner, more renewable energy in the province. In fact, Ontario's phase-out of coal-fired electricity generation by the end of 2014 is the single largest greenhouse gas reduction initiative in all of Canada.

Since 2005, replacing coal with clean energy has resulted in \$4.4 billion in avoided health care and environmental costs, 668 fewer premature deaths per year and 928 fewer hospital admissions per year.

In 2005, our government introduced the local air quality regulation known as regulation 419, which sets standards for substances that have human health or environmental impacts.

Since 2005, 68 new or updated air standards have been introduced for substances which are linked to health effects—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti:** Thank you, Speaker. I know my constituents, along with the rest of Ontario, will be pleased to hear the good work our government is doing to reduce air pollution.

Another initiative our government has been steadily improving is Ontario's Drive Clean program. Drive Clean plays an important role in protecting the quality of the air we breathe. Vehicles are a serious polluter, creating smog-causing emissions that can have a significant impact on the health of Ontarians.

Speaker, through you, could the Minister of the Environment explain the recent improvements our government has made to the Drive Clean program?

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Since the beginning of the program, Drive Clean has reduced smog-causing pollutants by 260,000 tonnes.

But even the most sophisticated equipment can still become a serious polluter—any of these vehicles could—if their emission systems are not properly maintained. That is why, in January of this year, our government phased in a more accurate testing technology that is expected to reduce emissions from on-road vehicles by an additional 20% over what can be achieved under the current test.

It's also important to note that there will be no additional costs to consumers. The testing fee will remain the same. All vehicles—cars, trucks and buses—less than seven years old no longer need to be tested when the registration is renewed. All vehicles—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

### CORRECTION OF RECORD

**Mr. John O'Toole:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: Earlier today, in my question to the Minister of Health, I misspoke by referring in my supplementary to the riding—I should have said Peterborough and I said Durham. I'd like to correct my record.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** On the point of order, the member does have a point of order, and he is allowed to correct his own record. I thank you for that.

There are no deferred votes. This House stands recessed until 3 p.m.

*The House recessed from 1138 to 1500.*

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** I am thrilled to have two former staffers here, one from the official opposition and one from the government; two people who worked really hard behind the scenes here. One was my former chief of staff; the other was an aide to former member Michael Bryant when he was House leader. I'd like to welcome to this place, back again on that side, Rod Elliott and Megan Boyle, and they have a friend here whose name is—

*Interjection.*

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** —Simon. Simon is here. Welcome.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** We do welcome our guests.

**Mr. John O'Toole:** Today I had the privilege of meeting one of my constituents—I expect him to be here shortly. The constituent is Jack Fonseca, who is from Campaign Life, talking to me on a number of issues. I highly respect the work they do, and I'd like to welcome him to Queen's Park today.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further introductions? Yes, member from—

**Ms. Soo Wong:** Scarborough—Agincourt.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** —Scarborough—Agincourt.

**Ms. Soo Wong:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I would like to recognize two recent accomplishments at Agincourt Collegiate Institute, a high school in my riding. Joining us today is the principal of the school, Louie Papathanasakis. Last night, Mr. Papathanasakis was honoured as one of Canada's outstanding principals in 2012 by the Learning Partnership. Great principals are the foundation to great schools, and they devote themselves to the success of their students. One of the former students of Mr. Papathanasakis, Gabriel Lee, stated that one of the reasons he went into teaching was because of "who Louie was and how he conducted himself."

Also here today are two Agincourt students, Matthew Ho and Assad Muhammad, as well as their family members: Sabana Perveen, Sobia Zulfi, David Ho and Sue Quan.

You may recognize Matthew's and Assad's names. This past month, they launched a Lego-man wielding the Canadian flag into near space. Videos and photos of the Lego-man's journey have gone viral on the Internet. Stories about the experiment have received international attention—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

I welcome our guests. I would also remind all of our members that this is a way of introducing people and possibly just saying what they do. After that, it does not become a statement. I would appreciate that very much.

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** You didn't like my five-minute statement on staffers?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you, member.

Further introductions? There being no further introductions, I would like to bring to your attention that we have with us in the Speaker's gallery today a member of the National Assembly of Cuba, Mr. Agustín Lage Davila. He is accompanied by the Consul General of Cuba at Toronto, Mr. Jorge Soberon. We welcome them to the House today. Mucho gusto.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### GREEN POWER GENERATION

**Mr. Monte McNaughton:** The issue of industrial wind turbines and the failed Green Energy Act is something that is of great concern to my constituents. To date, nearly 100 municipalities have passed resolutions calling for a moratorium on further turbine development. The most recent of these is, of course, the municipality of Strathroy-Caradoc in my riding.

I proudly support these local municipalities, but by ignoring these concerns, the McGuinty Liberals has sent the message that rural Ontario doesn't matter. Speaker,

the people of Ontario have been silenced for long enough, and that is why, on March 12 at 7 p.m., at Amy's Place restaurant in Strathroy, I will be hosting a public wind turbine and green energy town hall meeting.

To date, several MPPs, including our PC energy critic, Vic Fedeli, and MPPs Bailey, Thompson and Nicholls, have confirmed their attendance. I have also extended an invitation to the Minister of Energy, the Honourable Chris Bentley, who I hope will attend.

I'm happy to invite members of the public to attend this important meeting and look forward to hearing from our communities across Lambton—Kent—Middlesex.

### NEW CHOICES PROGRAM

**Miss Monique Taylor:** The New Choices program provides a valuable service to the Hamilton community. It's a program that offers new mothers with substance use concerns a full range of services in one location. It allows them to focus on developing the ability to combat addiction while enhancing their parenting skills, maintain or regain custody of their children and return to work or school.

The program focuses on mothers who want a chance to change the paths of their lives that have led them astray. They want to have the ability to be good parents, but they simply don't have the tools.

The New Choices program has been running for 14 years without secured funding, and it's now at risk. It's the kind of program that allows a family a better way to a healthy future, and in doing so, saves millions of dollars from other areas of health care and social services systems.

Allow me to quote one of the New Choice clients: "As a result of attending the New Choices program, I am now almost four years free and clean from a decade-long addiction to crack cocaine and other drugs. Children's aid closed my family's file over two years ago, and in 2010, I earned my diploma with honours at the top of my class for addictions and community services." This is just one of the many successful stories from the New Choices program.

I stand here today realizing the financial insecurities that we are facing, so I ask this government to please recognize the social and financial benefits that the New Choices program brings to my community.

### AGINCOURT COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE

**Ms. Soo Wong:** I apologize to the House for my enthusiasm earlier about the visitors.

Anyway, it's a great pleasure to introduce my colleagues and my friends who are here from Scarborough—Agincourt. First, I want to recognize Mr. Louie Papathanasakis, who has been recognized as one of 40 new outstanding principals of 2012. He's a great principal for Agincourt Collegiate Institute, so thank you, Louie.

The other two guests here are two Agincourt Collegiate students: Matthew Ho and Assad Muhammad.

The parents are finally here: Sabana Perveen, as well as Sobia Zulfi, David Ho and Sue Quan. These two young men have shown us what entrepreneurship as well as leadership is all about, in terms of science and technology. I want to welcome them as well as acknowledge their accomplishments.

### AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

**Mr. Rod Jackson:** I had the pleasure to attend the Canadian International AutoShow produced by the Toronto Automobile Dealers Association last week with many of my colleagues.

TADA represents dealers from Ontario's number one industry: automotive. These dealerships bring thousands of jobs and revenue to our province. In fact, in any given week, 47,000 people are employed by dealerships in Ontario.

TADA is also active in the community, contributing to the Canadian Safe School Network and the Trillium Gift of Life Network, among others. TADA deserves recognition for their efforts to support our struggling economy and various community groups.

The auto show itself is Canada's largest consumer show, attracting over 300,000 visitors every year. The show features over 1,000 automobiles, with an estimated value of the exhibits at the show, not including the vehicles, of \$60 million. The estimated value of the cars alone is \$30 million, the amount that our deficit may be in a few years.

I want to thank the CIAS board of directors for the successful event, including CIAS president Joel Cohen and board members Sandy Liguori, Frank Romeo, Benjamin Leung and Ron Loveys.

I'm very familiar with the effects that dealerships have on employment in communities. My family is in the car business, and has been for over 80 years.

Essentially, new-car dealerships are an integral aspect of Ontario's economy, providing thousands of jobs, and should be commended for those efforts, especially during this tenuous time for hard-working families.

1510

### TEMISKAMING NORDIC SKI CLUB

**Mr. John Vanthof:** On Saturday, February 25, the Temiskaming Nordic Ski Club celebrated its 20th anniversary. The many smiling faces were as radiant as the beautiful winter sunshine. With 18 kilometres of world-class skate and classic skiing trails, the 300 members are justifiably proud of the facility that they have built. The beautiful log chalet is the perfect place to wind down after a run.

The creation and maintenance of the ski club is truly a co-operative effort. The Ontario government, the township of Coleman and neighbouring landowners have provided the land base, and all the labour is provided by volunteers. The club members are justifiably proud of the fact that all this has been accomplished without incurring any debt.

The anniversary celebration was tinged with sadness: One of the club's founding members passed away in January. Doug Worth was a shining light not only for the ski club but across the area. He taught Timiskaming District Secondary School for a quarter of a century. Doug was one of those teachers who took a keen interest in the lives and achievements of his students long after they left the classroom. He was passionate about math, jazz music and, of course, the outdoors. He was not only one of the founders of the club but one of its early explorers, making trails there with snowshoes years before the club was formed. Mr. Doug Worth's memorial service was held in the school gymnasium and was attended by hundreds of his friends. He will be fondly remembered by those who enjoy the trails that he helped create.

### AUTO21

**Mrs. Teresa Piruzza:** Yesterday morning, I had the pleasure of welcoming AUTO21 to the Ontario Legislature. AUTO21 is Canada's automotive R&D program, supported through the government of Canada's Networks of Centres of Excellence. And what better place to house it than in Windsor?

AUTO21's mission is to build a stronger automotive sector in Canada through excellence in public and private sector collaborative research and the development of human and social capital.

I also had the opportunity to meet with AUTO21's executive team in Windsor, and I have to say that they truly live up to their motto of "Innovation through Research Excellence."

Windsor has a proud automotive and manufacturing history. I was amazed by the support that AUTO21 was providing local industry as well as provincially, helping position Ontario as a leader in world-class R&D.

Empowering our researchers is a key to creating a vibrant and prosperous industry. AUTO21 brings together nearly 200 top Canadian researchers at 46 universities and partners them with 120 industry and government partners; as well, it provides students with opportunities for practical research experience.

Speaker, as the MPP for Windsor West, I would like to congratulate AUTO21 for their great work in enhancing Ontario's position as a world-class leader in automotive research and development.

### INTERNATIONAL RARE DISEASE DAY

**Mrs. Christine Elliott:** I'm pleased to rise on behalf of the Ontario PC caucus to welcome Simon Ibell of the iBelieve Foundation. Welcome.

Today marks International Rare Disease Day, an event that's committed to bringing awareness to rare diseases, their impact on patients and the need for greater access to treatment. Due to small patient populations, companies often have little incentive to develop drugs for rare conditions.

Caught between debilitating illness and a rare diagnosis, patients are left to fight for their lives by seeking their own funding, research and cures. Approximately one in 12 Canadians, or 2.8 million people, suffer from one of 7,000 rare diseases. Most rare diseases are life-threatening or debilitating. About 80% are genetic, and 75% affect infants and children.

Unfortunately, unlike other jurisdictions around the world, Ontario has yet to develop a comprehensive co-operative strategy to tackle rare diseases and provide the care that every Ontarian deserves.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Simon and everyone who is committed to raising awareness on this important issue. Your commitment to this worthy cause is both encouraging and inspirational. Thank you, Simon.

### NATIONAL BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** I'm pleased to take this opportunity to share with the Ontario Legislature that March is National Brain Awareness Month. Brain awareness month is championed by Neurological Health Charities Canada, a coalition of 26 health charities working to improve the quality of life for people living with neurological diseases, disorders and injuries.

The coming month is an opportunity for us to be mindful of the importance of brain health and safety, recognizing that the brain is the body's most critical organ. With brain issues, every aspect of one's life can be affected. You may be surprised to learn that in this province more than two million people are living with a neurological condition for which there are limited treatments and no cures. Brain conditions affect young and old, and the impact is felt by families and communities across Ontario.

Living with a brain condition is more than a health issue because, inevitably, a chronic brain disorder permanently changes a life. It creates issues and challenges that did not previously exist. It impacts everything about the present and the future, including family relationships, employment, housing, financial stability, education, health and social interaction.

As our population ages, the prevalence of neurological conditions is expected to increase significantly. For example, the number of Ontarians with dementia is expected to increase twofold in the next 15 years.

I encourage all members to learn more about these challenges and those who live with them, and to reflect on how we might improve the lives of those affected through specialized care, neuroscience research and ensuring that our youth understand the importance of protecting the health and safety of this most vital organ.

### BARRHAVEN FOOD CUPBOARD

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** Do you want to hear some good news?

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Yes.

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** Of course, everyone wants to hear some good news every once in a while. We know we're dealing with some tough economic times here in the province of Ontario, and that extends to many of the households in our communities. But let me tell you some good news of how my community came together just before Christmas to make a difference in the lives of so many families.

On December 13, I received an email from the Barrhaven Food Cupboard that said that for the first time ever, our affluent community had an empty food cupboard. I had a regularly scheduled breakfast on the 17th. My staff moved quickly into action with the Barrhaven Food Cupboard, and in three days, media like CFRA, the Barrhaven Independent, the EMC community newspaper and the Ottawa Sun drove people to our food bank. We were able to work together to feed hundreds of people a free pancake breakfast, and they raised for us in three short days over \$1,000 in cash that was going to feed all of the families in need, but also, we raised so much food that we were able to feed all those families for two weeks.

As a result of that, Mr. Speaker, right before Christmas, the Barrhaven community has come together in a way that they hadn't in the past. They're going to be more organized for this food cupboard.

I want to say thank you to Ken Ross, who has taken on that issue—he is with Ross' Independent Grocer—as well as other people like Ken Lee, who sprung into action so quickly.

Mr. Speaker, there is good news across Ontario, and it's happening in our communities, and we need to thank those volunteers who make it happen.

### STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

#### ANTI-BULLYING INITIATIVES

**Hon. Eric Hoskins:** Mr. Speaker, I want to wish you and all members of this House a very happy Pink Shirt Day, and I want to thank all members who are wearing pink today in support of this great cause, including, obviously, members behind me who are quite extravagant—I'm not sure if it's exactly pink; nonetheless, I am basking in his reflected glow.

As we often say when we talk about putting a stop to bullying in our schools, this is not something that can be done by any one person. It takes all of us, speaking with one voice and working together to make the lives of our young people better and to give them hope. Without the support and dedication of students, parents, teachers, school board staff and community partners, we can't fight bullying. Pink Shirt Day is a perfect example of the impact we can have when we speak with one voice, when we work together to make positive change and inspire others to do the same.

Pink Shirt Day started when a ninth grader in Nova Scotia was bullied simply for wearing a pink shirt. Seeing what was going on, two schoolmates of that boy brought pink shirts to school and handed them out to friends. These two young men decided that they weren't going to stand idly by while someone was being bullied. They took action to help one of their schoolmates, to show that there was nothing wrong with boys wearing pink, and in the process, they started a nationwide movement.

1520

Mr. Speaker, the power of what those two students and fellow students did, the power of that act of compassion and solidarity, was to tell their schoolmate and all victims of bullying that you are not alone. That feeling of loneliness, of isolation, is a feeling that many students have felt, especially students who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans or queer, or even students who may be perceived to just be different. Those young people need to hear not only from their fellow students but from the adults in their life, from their teachers, their mentors and from elected officials at all levels of government. They need to hear: You are not alone. They need to hear: You are supported. They need to hear: You are loved. They need to hear these words, and we as adults must be clear as day: We will not tolerate, for a second, anyone making them feel otherwise.

As my colleague Laurel Broten, the Minister of Education, has said in this House many times, the words we use every day must send a clear message that we will not tolerate bullying, discrimination and hatred. Those words must be used to send a much better message, one of acceptance, one of caring and one of support.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud that our government is working to deliver that message through our words, and like students, teachers and staff who are wearing pink today, we are delivering that message through our actions—and I must acknowledge that members of all political parties in this Legislature stand behind these efforts.

In November, the Minister of Education introduced legislation that, if passed, will help make our schools safer by ensuring that boards take preventive measures against bullying, that boards consider tougher consequences for bullying and support students who want to promote understanding and respect for all. The proposed legislation is part of a comprehensive action plan to make our schools safe and make them more accepting places to learn. We will continue to look at new ways to raise public awareness about the issue of bullying.

Our plan also features expanded mental health supports for children and youth that were introduced in the last budget and which are already finding their way into our schools. I can't stress enough, Mr. Speaker, just how important these mental health supports are for our children and our youth. For young people who are bullied, that feeling of isolation and loneliness can lead to depression, and we need to be there for our kids when they need us the most. We're hiring new mental health workers across the province to make sure that mental

health services are available when and where they're needed most, because we need to be there for our children and our youth. They need to know that they're not alone. They need to know that they are supported and that they are loved.

Once again, I want to commend all members of all parties for their diligent and very serious efforts to eradicate bullying in our schools and throughout every environment in Ontario. Let's make sure we deliver on that promise, that our actions match those words not just today, but every day here in Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Responses?**

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** I'm pleased to rise on behalf of Tim Hudak and the Ontario Progressive Conservative caucus to support Pink Shirt Day here in the province of Ontario and, just as importantly, across Canada. I'm very proud of my colleagues here today who showed up in pink. I know, with our wardrobes that we have to pack on a Sunday night, they preplanned, many of these members, because they don't come from the city of Toronto.

I also had to preplan for pink day, because my daughter is in grade 1 at Manordale Public School in Nepean, one of the finest institutions in this whole province, and they celebrate this awareness day. So on the weekend, my husband and I were planning for the week and made sure that she had something pink to wear today. We were talking about Pink Shirt Day, and it was my husband who came out with a quote from Edmund Burke, one of his favourites: that "all that is required for evil to triumph is for good people to do nothing."

I couldn't be more proud of the people in this Legislature. From time to time we disagree; in fact, that's normal. But one of the good things about this issue, bullying and eradicating it in our province and across Canada, is the fact that we have people from all three political parties who agree that we need to change things, and we're working hard.

Pink Shirt Day was a result of a grassroots initiative in the province I was born and raised in. In fact, the school that introduced Pink Shirt Day, Central Kings high school, was not very far from where my husband went to school. He tells me, of course, that Central Kings was much rougher than West Kings, where he went, but it speaks to what can happen when we encourage our youth to make a change in their communities. In this case, there was a young fellow being bullied because he wore a pink shirt to school, so two of the seniors in the school decided they weren't going to stand for that anymore. They bought 50 T-shirts at a local store, and the whole student body decided they were going to participate; 50 people showed up and circled that young fellow. Let me give you an example. Some of you live in big cities. Growing up in New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, we had 105 people in our grade 12 class. That's a very significant chunk of the student population there.

Today, people from around the world recognize Pink Shirt Day as a day of change. Now, I might say this: We shouldn't just have one day to try to eradicate bullying; it

should be every day. We should talk about it with our children and their teachers. We should make sure we communicate that we do not tolerate it.

One very important thing I learned growing up was that it's important to respect—not necessarily accept—other people's points of view. But it is important that all of us in this chamber know that this is a problem. I have to say that as we move forward with debating bullying in this chamber, there are some significant points on the table.

There's one person in particular since I've been elected to this House who has stood above the rest, who has worked hard to make sure that bullying is not only addressed in our schools but in this chamber. That's why I'd like to just recognize at this point in time my colleague Elizabeth Witmer, the former education minister, a former education critic, a former board chair and a former teacher, who has brought to this place a sensitivity that I think started long before what we've seen in our schools lately, which is causing some children in our province to take their own lives or to quit school or to self-harm. Her leadership, I think, started much before this issue hit the headlines, and I really want to thank her for that.

Now we have a minority Parliament here and we have an opportunity not only to speak to this issue and to communicate to parents, students and teachers, but to change things with legislation. As a member of the opposition in a minority Parliament, I can think of no better time when great minds across this province can get together to put forward the right piece of legislation that will actually solve some of these problems. We can't be politically partisan on this issue. In fact, I urge members not to be. There are too many, too many, too many students who need us to do better.

We now know we have race-based, gender-based, height-based, weight-based and red-hair, freckle-faced bullying in our schools. It's much worse than when any of us were there. Now we have cyberbullying, which makes it feel unsafe to be in your own home if you are a young person who has been bullied. In fact, today I was on Twitter, and a Global TV IT person was tweeting that she now finds that her former tormenters want to be her friends on Facebook, and this individual is now an adult. I mean, that's how it reaches us and that's what happens.

So let's go back to Edmund Burke's quote. He once said, "All that is required for evil to triumph is for good people to do nothing." I say today, we are all good people. I know we are all here with the best of intentions. In today's Vancouver Sun, John Izzo took that statement from Edmund Burke further and said, "The converse is also true: All that is required to change things is for more of us—parents, teens and bystanders—to step up, speak up and let our voices be heard." Very well said, John Izzo.

To all of the members in this assembly, happy Pink Shirt Day. We're making a difference. Let's take that back to our communities.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Responses? The member from Hamilton Mountain.

**Miss Monique Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the Minister of Children and Youth Services, as well as the member from Nepean—Carleton, for their commitment and words on this very important issue that is before this House.

#### 1530

Bullying affects every community and every school in Ontario. It can devastate the lives of our young people and impact our lives as adults. We are all very aware of the tragic impact bullying has had on the lives of our youth and of some who have been driven to take their own lives. Today, we remember these youth and all of the youth who face harassment and discrimination, and we must make a commitment to making Ontario's communities safe and accepting places for all of our young people.

Today, the statistics paint a concerning picture. A 2009 survey of grades 7 to 12 students by the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health found that almost one in three students have been bullied at school. A 2011 national climate survey by Egale found that 64% of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer students, and 61% of students with LGBTQ parents, felt unsafe at school.

But beyond the statistics, we simply need to listen to the voices of our youth, voices like the two Nova Scotia high school students who took a stand in 2007 and started Pink Shirt Day. It was these youth who saw the devastating impact of bullying on a fellow student, and it was these youth who understood the importance of awareness and taking a stand. The youth have been leaders at working to end bullying, and as MPPs, we must ask ourselves: Are we doing our part to help end bullying? Are we listening to Ontario's teachers, teachers who have been leaders in the goals of eliminating bullying from our classrooms? The sad answer to this question is no; we're not doing enough.

The government has focused on a new bill, Bill 13, the Accepting Schools Act, and they seem to imply that this will be the solution to bullying in Ontario. But the causes of bullying are complex, as is going to be the solution. The Safe Schools Action Team said this in 2008, as did the roots-of-violence report. Have these recommendations been implemented? Do we have a comprehensive approach in place? Again, the sad answer is no.

For starters, we must ask ourselves: Will this bill provide teachers and school boards with the resources to address bullying and issues like homophobia? We know that Bill 13 will ramp up the consequences for bullying, but it provides no guarantee that students can start a gay-straight alliance in their school. Egale says that by simply existing, GSAs present students with the idea that LGBTQ identities have a place in the school, and in society at large. "Directly engaging LGBTQ youth and their allies within school, as well as those who are ambivalent regarding LGBTQ themes, is an excellent means towards addressing school climate, isolation, promoting

social connectedness....” So why is this government failing to protect the rights of students to start a GSA?

Bill 13 does not address other factors which are undermining school safety, such as timely access to professional supports, alternative programming for at-risk or special needs students, or inadequate staffing and funding for anti-bullying programs.

The children and youth of this province are looking to us as MPPs to do more than simply say the right words on Pink Shirt Day. They want action and they want communities free of bullying, harassment and violence. New Democrats stand with Ontario’s youth, and we are ready to make the changes needed to make this a reality.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I thank all members for their comments.

It is now time for petitions.

## PETITIONS

### RURAL SCHOOLS

**Mr. John O’Toole:** I have a petition here from my riding—very important. It reads as follows:

“Whereas Cartwright High School is an important part” of the community of Blackstock in the area of Scugog township and is an important part of the community; and

“Whereas Dalton McGuinty promised in the 2007 election that he would keep rural schools open when he declared that, ‘Rural schools help to keep communities strong’; and

“Whereas schools in rural areas are” indeed “community places; and

“Whereas Cartwright students, families, friends and staff have created an effective learning experience that emphasizes a community atmosphere, individual attention and full participation by students in school activities; and

“Whereas the framework of rural schools is different from urban schools and therefore deserves to be governed by a rural school policy;”—a difference—and

“Whereas the McGuinty government found \$12 million to keep school swimming pools open in Toronto but hasn’t found” one penny “to keep rural schools open in communities such as Blackstock;

“Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“That Dalton McGuinty and the Minister of Education support the Cartwright High School community and suspend plans to close Cartwright High School under the school board’s accommodation review process until the province develops a rural school policy that respects the value of” small “schools in rural” settings across Ontario.

I’m pleased to sign and support this on behalf of my constituents and present it to Judy, one of the pages here.

## DIAGNOSTIC SERVICES

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** I have this petition from the people of Nickel Belt, and it reads as follows:

“Whereas the Ontario government is making ... (PET) scanning a publicly insured health service available to cancer and cardiac patients...; and

“Whereas ... insured PET scans” are available since 2009 “in Ottawa, London, Toronto, Hamilton and Thunder Bay; and

“Whereas the city of Greater Sudbury is a hub for health care in northeastern Ontario, with” Health Sciences North, “its regional cancer program and the Northern Ontario School of Medicine;

“We ... petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make PET scans available through” Health Sciences North, “thereby serving and providing equitable access to the citizens of northeastern Ontario.”

I fully support this petition, will affix my name to it and ask page David to bring it to the Clerk.

## EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** I have a petition from Avalon Public School parents in Ottawa—Orléans.

“To the Legislature of Ontario:

“Whereas the current enrolment of Avalon Public School is 687 students;

“Whereas the student capacity of the school is 495 students, as determined by the Ministry of Education’s own occupancy formula;

“Whereas the issue of overcrowding and lack of space makes it impossible for Avalon Public School to offer full-day kindergarten until the overcrowding issue is addressed;

“Whereas Avalon Public School is located in a high-growth community;

“Whereas the enrolment at Avalon Public School is expected to continue rising at a rate of 10% to 15% a year for the foreseeable future;

“Whereas the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board has made building a new school in Avalon a top capital priority;

“We, the undersigned, call on the province of Ontario and Ministry of Education to provide the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board with the necessary funding to build an additional school in Avalon, to open no later than September 2014.”

I support this petition, and I send it forward with Rachel.

## WIND TURBINES

**Mr. Todd Smith:** I have another large stack of petitions here opposed to industrial wind construction.

“To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas there is a growing body of evidence confirming industrial wind development has serious adverse effects on host communities;

"Whereas over 135 people in Ontario have reported serious negative health effects from industrial wind development, and at least a dozen families have been bought out of their homes;

"Whereas Ontario's Green Energy Act has ended local planning control by stripping municipal councils of their rights;

"Whereas 80 municipal councils, representing two million Ontarians, called on the government to put in place a full moratorium on industrial wind development until an independent epidemiological health study is completed, proper environmental regulations and protections are put in place, and local democracy is restored;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Immediately put a moratorium on all industrial wind proposals; fund an independent epidemiological health study to develop safe setbacks; legislate those findings; develop stringent environmental protection standards for natural areas; and require all projects to comply with regulations based on science and local planning."

I agree with this petition and will sign it and send it to the table with David.

#### DOG OWNERSHIP

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** This petition reads as follows:

"Whereas currently the law takes the onus off of owners that raise violent dogs by making it appear that violence is a matter of genetics; and

"Whereas the Dog Owners' Liability Act does not clearly define a pit bull, nor is it enforced equally across the province, as pit bulls are not an acknowledged breed; 1540

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Legislative Assembly passes Bill 16, the Public Safety Related to Dogs Statute Law Amendment Act, 2011, into law."

I certainly agree. Thousands more are to follow. I will sign this and give it to Shirley, our page.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member for Durham.

**Mr. John O'Toole:** Speaker, I'm pleased to present a petition, and I thank you for that recognition.

"Whereas citizens are concerned that contaminants in materials used as fill for pits and quarries may endanger water quality and the natural environment of the greenbelt; and

"Whereas the Ministry of the Environment has a responsibility and a duty to protect the sensitive areas of the greenbelt and provincially significant wetlands; and

"Whereas the government of Ontario has the lead responsibility to provide the tools to lower-tier governments to plan, protect and enforce clear, effective policies governing the application and permitting process for

the placement of fill"—commercial fill—"in abandoned pits and quarries" and elsewhere; "and

"Whereas this process requires clarification regarding rules respecting what materials may be used to rehabilitate or fill abandoned pits and quarries;"—I spoke to the Ministry of the Environment on this today.

"Therefore we, the undersigned, ask the Minister of the Environment to initiate a moratorium on the clean fill application and permit process on the greenbelt until there are clear rules; and we further ask that the provincial government take all necessary actions to protect our water and prevent contamination of the greenbelt" and the Oak Ridges moraine, specifically in my riding of Durham.

Thank you for the opportunity. I'm pleased to sign, support it and present it to James Newman, actually.

#### KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I have a petition today from a really fine individual, Robin Bissett from Cobourg, Ontario. He wanted to make sure that I got his petition, and I told him I'd read it into the record for him this afternoon. It is a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, Canada, draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to the following:

"Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada;

"Whereas real progress is being made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease, in particular the development of a bioartificial kidney;

"We, the undersigned, call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make research funding available for the explicit purpose of conducting bioartificial kidney research as an extension to the research being successfully conducted at several centres in the United States."

I agree with Mr. Bissett's petition. I'll affix my signature to it and give it to page Samantha.

#### LONG-TERM CARE

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** We do have a petition here signed by a great number of constituents in the great riding of Oxford county, and it is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Tavistock's Bonnie Brae Health Care Centre is an 80-bed, D-class nursing home that must be either rebuilt or closed by July 2014; and

"Whereas there is currently an application by a private operator to move the 80 licensed beds outside of Oxford county to the city of London, despite the recent opening of two other long-term-care homes in Middlesex county in 2010; and

"Whereas long-term-care wait times in Oxford county can be as much as 134 days longer than in Middlesex county; and

"Whereas Tavistock receives referrals from the nearby Waterloo Wellington CCAC, which has among the highest waits for long-term care in the province;

"We, the undersigned, request that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario retain these beds in Tavistock and seek partners to fast-track replacement of the Bonnie Brae as part of Ontario's 10-year plan to modernize 35,000 long-term-care beds."

I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to make this presentation of the petition. I will sign it, as I agree with it.

#### SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION

**Mr. Toby Barrett:** "Petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Grand Erie District School Board has purposely gerrymandered busing, circumvented its own catchment areas, avoided all but the most basic facility improvements and actively positioned PDCS for closure before and during the ARC process;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"We petition the Legislature of Ontario to conduct an inquiry into the actions of the Grand Erie District School Board over the past 10 years leading up to the current accommodation review.

"In addition, we call upon the Legislature to put a moratorium on all current and pending school closures in the province of Ontario."

I agree with these sentiments and affix my signature.

#### SKILLED TRADES

**Mr. Jim McDonell:** "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas a new policy from the Electrical Safety Authority that mandates that all electrical contractors must have at least one licensed master electrician on staff for every business effective December 31, 2011, is forcing electrical contracting small businesses in Ontario out of business;

"Whereas this ESA policy severely impacts small electrical contracting businesses in Ontario. George, in my riding of Stormont-Dundas-South Glengarry, who has been in the electrical trade for the past 51 years and a small business owner for the past 36 ... , who has good standing with the Electrical Safety Authority, Ontario Hydro, local utilities, who follows the same rules and regulations of the ESA, follows the Ontario electrical codes, adheres to the same inspections and pays the same fees as large companies, will not be allowed to renew his electrical ... licence. Effective December 31, 2011, George" was no longer licensed to practise in Ontario and he was forced out of business.

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to request the Minister of Consumer Services to direct the Electrical Safety Authority of Ontario to modify the licensing requirements to allow

small electrical contractors and self-employed electricians to work in the residential and rural market without the unnecessary burden of obtaining a master electrician licence, or at the very minimum, grandfather those who are currently qualified and entitled to work in Ontario."

I will be signing this in support and agreement.

#### KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I just received another petition from a good friend of mine, Terry Carpenter, who lives at 726 Bellaire Street in the south end of Peterborough, Ontario.

"Petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, Canada, draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to the following:

"Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada;

"Whereas real progress has been made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease, in particular the development of a bioartificial kidney;

"We, the undersigned, call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make research funding available for the explicit purpose of conducting bioartificial kidney research as an extension to the research being successfully conducted at several centres in the United States" of America.

I agree with this petition and will affix my signature to it and give to page Kriti.

#### WIND TURBINES

**Mr. Rob E. Milligan:** I have a petition here from many who come from the fine village of Norwood in the member for Peterborough's riding.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas there is a growing body of evidence confirming industrial wind development has serious adverse effects on host communities;

"Whereas over 135 people in Ontario have reported serious negative health effects from industrial wind development, and at least a dozen families have been bought out of their homes;

"Whereas Ontario's Green Energy Act has ended local planning control by stripping municipal councils of their rights;

"Whereas 80 municipal councils, representing two million Ontarians, called on the government to put in place a full moratorium on industrial wind development until an independent epidemiological health study is completed, proper environmental regulations and protections are put in place, and local democracy is restored;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Immediately put a moratorium on all industrial wind proposals; fund an independent epidemiological health study to develop safe setbacks; legislate those findings; develop stringent environmental protection standards for

natural areas; and require all projects to comply with regulations based on science and local planning.”

I agree wholeheartedly with this petition and I will affix my name to it—from the village of Norwood.

#### DOG OWNERSHIP

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** This petition reads as follows; it's a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

“Whereas currently the law takes the onus off of owners that raise violent dogs by making it appear that violence is a matter of genetics; and

1550

“Whereas the Dog Owners' Liability Act does not clearly define a pit bull, nor is it enforced equally across the province, as pit bulls are not an acknowledged breed;

“We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

“That the Legislative Assembly passes Bill 16, the Public Safety Related to Dogs Statute Law Amendment Act, 2011, into law.”

Of course I agree, and I am going to give it to Darren to be delivered to the table.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Thank you. The time for petitions is over.

#### OPPOSITION DAY

##### TAXATION

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** I move that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario reaffirms its support for the planned reduction of the business tax rate on Ontario's job creators to 10% by next year, to help get the nearly 600,000 unemployed Ontarians working again.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The Leader of the Opposition has moved motion number 1. I recognize the leader.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Thank you very much, Speaker. I'm pleased to initiate debate on this opposition day motion focused on creating jobs and opportunity again in the province of Ontario by making sure that we have a tax climate and an investment climate that is number one in Canada for creating jobs again.

The issue before the assembly this afternoon is the business climate in Ontario today. It's best characterized, at best, by uncertainty, which you and I as individuals may find uncomfortable—we have to live with it from time to time; that's part of life—but in business, uncertainty can be deadly. To business leaders, small business owners and planners, uncertainty is a serious problem. Sadly, uncertainty can be a fatal problem.

Today in Ontario, our job creators, our job-creating businesses, are not confident about a lot of things when it comes to the current government of Ontario. They've watched a pre-election deficit of \$15 billion become a post-election deficit of \$16 billion almost like magic, and now they're seeing from an objective, respected econ-

omist, Don Drummond, a forecast of a \$30-billion deficit by 2017-18 if we don't change course. In fact, Mr. Drummond estimates it will be nearly tripling Ontario's provincial debt to almost \$400 billion, certainly at variance with what we heard from the government in the recent budget and the campaign. It's created a lot of uncertainty for families across the province and public sector employees, of course, but also business investors and job creators.

They've also watched not simply one but two major international credit rating agencies sound the alarm about the government's paralysis in confronting our jobs crisis and our debt crisis here in Ontario. Today, as we debate this important motion, they're watching us right now to see what the next steps will be.

People worried about getting a job, those who are underemployed, those who are considering investing in Ontario have a very simple question for all of us: “What is the tax rate going to be on my business next year?”

In fact, Speaker, to be technically accurate, they don't even know what their tax rate is going to be in a few months. Right now, under the laws passed by this assembly, on July 1, 2012, the tax rate on businesses is to go down; and then a following reduction on July 1, 2013, towards a 10% tax rate.

If businesses, whatever their size, don't know what the tax rate is going to be and they don't know what the government's plan is to reduce the deficit, how do they make business plans? What kind of signal does that send to those contemplating investing in Canada or North America that Ontario should be the place to invest? I want to see them investing here, but given this uncertainty, how can they forecast sales? How can they forecast revenues and investment costs? How can they hire new people without knowing what the game plan is? They don't even know what the tax rate is going to be in the next few months. So imagine what kind of impact that has on stability, on predictability, on confidence in Ontario—the things that businesses need most to do what they do best: invest, innovate, compete, create jobs.

That's the question largely for my colleagues opposite. They can answer that question, and they can vote for our motion today to lower taxes on job creators and help get our economy moving again. I know that everyone—each of us, all 107 members, whether you represent the city of Toronto, the beautiful Niagara-Hamilton area, northern Ontario, Stoney Creek, eastern Ontario, southwestern Ontario or the London area that was devastated by the closure of Cat recently—all of us know. We have people that have come to us in our offices and at town hall meetings; they're worried about their job. They're worried about where their sons and daughters are going to go when they graduate and they want to know what the game plan is. So we have an opportunity this afternoon to send a signal to say that we're on the right path and to say to those folks who are out of work, looking for jobs and worried about their kids, small business owners and large, what direction Ontario is heading in.

Clearly, the Ontario PC caucus wants to see Ontario as the best place in Canada to create jobs and start a busi-

ness and to see it grow. We need to be open for business again. That's why people deserve some straight talk, directness from Queen's Park and an answer this evening on what that game plan is. So let's have that candid look at the facts before us.

As I said in this House and my colleagues have said as well, we do have a major debt crisis in the province of Ontario. The Drummond report has glaringly confirmed that the size and cost of government is simply unsustainable, and the prospect of a \$30-billion deficit makes that frighteningly clear. So, too, are the warnings by the major bond rating agencies that unless we take action, Speaker, and immediate action, we could face downgrades on our creditworthiness. That means the cost of borrowing on this large accumulated debt is going to increase and perpetuate the spiral.

Here's fact number 2. While urgent action is needed on our bloated spending to rein in the size and cost of our public sector, we know this is a fact as well: You simply can't cut your way to prosperity. You need a jobs-and-growth plan at the same time. There's no doubt that getting the deficit under control and going towards balance by 2017-18 will send a good signal; that will help us on our way. But you need a jobs-and-growth plan focused on opening Ontario up for investment.

And each and every day, my colleagues and I, we try to present good ideas to do so. We recognize the government is not going to take them all. We live in the real world, not the dream world: We know they're not going to agree to all of them. But they actually once believed in lowering the business tax rate to 10% next year. I hope that they still do.

We need to focus not only on balancing the books and responding to the Drummond report, we also need to focus on that long-neglected other side of the ledger: our stagnant private sector economy. It is this need for an integrated approach to turning our fortunes around that is missing. The Drummond report was part of that solution. We have other ideas on reducing the size and cost of government, including a public sector pay freeze.

What the Drummond report didn't produce was that path forward on the jobs side. So we're going to help with that. I think one of the challenges we have is that we've seen the government pull more and more ideas off the table. I think it's some \$4.2 billion in spending to date and counting. The hole is so deep that some observers, including DBRS, the Dominion Bond Rating Service, are showing a strong concern, even a fear, that this government won't follow through on reducing spending.

What I worry about is they're going to turn to tax increases instead. And I don't want to engage in a silly game of semantics, whether they call it a freeze or an increase. The fact of the matter is, if they don't follow through on the 10% rate reduction for 2013, taxes will be higher than they otherwise would have been, and that sends the wrong signal to businesses that have been counting on this, and job creators. It is going to make creating jobs in Ontario that much more difficult, and that will rob us of the competitive advantage that other

provinces, like Alberta and BC have. They're already at 10%.

#### 1600

And this is the other side of the equation: the need to kick-start the real economy with a pro-growth agenda; to unleash Ontario's once dynamic private sector with the right tax and regulatory climate that gets government out of the way, that gets behind businesses to drive investment and innovation; to create well-paid jobs in the province of Ontario again—and all with the ultimate goal of making government more focused, affordable and efficient, while giving private sector the room to do what it does best: to compete, to innovate, to create jobs. But we're not seeing enough of that in Ontario today.

So we will continue to advocate for an immediate legislated public sector pay freeze, and we will subject government initiatives to a very straightforward three-part stress test: (1) Does it reduce the size and cost of government? (2) does it create private sector jobs again? and (3) does it bring greater accountability and transparency to government? And if the government makes the tough decisions when it comes to spending reforms, we'll support them. We actually want to see it happen. We'll be serious about our role, but we'll be demanding that it passes those three tests.

So I think the only way forward, Speaker, out of this mess that we're in, after years of overspending, is to be very direct and level with the people of the province of Ontario. The answer, when it comes to spending, has got to be no, we just can't afford it. But the answer to private sector job creation has got to be yes, and it's got to be yes again, Speaker. And we're going to keep pressing.

We in the Ontario PC caucus have never stopped believing in the great future of this beautiful province of Ontario and its hard-working, industrious, innovative people. We still believe our best days are yet to come, Mr. Speaker; we just need to make the right decisions to help them out, to move forward again.

We're putting good ideas on the table. We want to modernize our apprenticeship system to help create 200,000 more jobs in the skilled trades: electricians, plumbers, welders. There's too much talent going out west right now. So let's take our apprenticeship system into the 21st century, move to a 1-to-1 ratio and open up 200,000 positions.

When it comes to our regulatory environment, we need to drain this swamp that seems to bog everybody down when they have the audacity to try to create a job in the province of Ontario. Let's change the attitude, and stop this cycle where they have to wait impatiently for that email or that call from a bureaucrat that never arrives, or three bureaucrats giving three different directions. Let's actually get behind our businesses, get out of their way, help them to innovate and create jobs. Let's change the attitude, clear aside these regulatory burdens that are holding us back and support innovation and job creation in every sector in the province of Ontario.

The third part of our plan: making energy reliable and affordable. I know there's going to be no parades for me

at some of the solar or wind turbine companies in the province of Ontario; I recognize that, Speaker. I just think that the approach that we've taken has turned what's been a historic strength in Ontario of reliable and affordable energy, which made Ontario the manufacturing heartland not just of Canada but of North America, that made us the engine that drove this mighty country—I believe those days can still happen in Ontario if we got an energy policy that actually made sense, that supported job creation in the province of Ontario.

Finally, Speaker, an essential part of this plan is to lower the business tax rate to stay on the path we're on today, to send the signal of stability; that we're not changing our minds once again when it comes to business tax rates, that we want to make Ontario open for business investment again.

I do hope my colleagues opposite will support the plan they actually had once agreed upon: to go to that 10% business tax rate by 2013, to stay on this path of opening up Ontario. We're not going to solve all of Ontario's problems on debt alone. We need a growth and a jobs plan. I'm going to fight for that every day, Speaker, because we believe that there are better days ahead of us. We believe Ontario will lead this great country again. We believe Ontario will lead North America again, but we have to make sure we have a jobs and growth plan, and I hope my colleagues opposite will support our plan.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Thank you. Leader of the third party?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very, very much. I'm glad to get up to have a chance to speak to the motion today.

You know, New Democrats have known for quite some time and have believed for quite some time—and we continue to believe, Speaker—that no-strings-attached corporate tax giveaways are not the right way for Ontario to go, and I think it won't surprise anyone that New Democrats will be voting against the motion put forward by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon. I'm looking forward to seeing, however, how the Liberal members across the way are going to be voting on this motion this afternoon.

You know, when New Democrats called the Premier's corporate tax cuts into question, here are some of the responses that we—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Could I ask that the sidebars—everyone listened intently to the leader of the official opposition. The leader of the third party deserves the same treatment, so if you have any sidebars, I would ask you to take them outside. Thank you.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Thank you very much, Speaker. I appreciate that.

As I was starting to say, I'm curious to see how the Liberals across the way are going to be voting on this motion, because when New Democrats called the Premier's corporate tax cuts into question, there were some very interesting responses that came from the Liberal benches, and I'm going to share a few of them with you:

"What the NDP want to do is create jobs in Alberta." That's what the Minister of Finance said on February 24, 2011. The Ontario NDP plan will "kill jobs," the Minister of Finance said as well on February 24, 2011. "Ontarians know a vote for the NDP means killing jobs," said the finance minister on October 2, 2011.

Here's what the Minister of Finance said when New Democrats proposed an end to the corporate tax giveaway for high-priced meals and box seats: "It represents killing a huge job creation initiative." That was on September 13, 2011. On September 9, "The NDP's plan is a crushing job killer' given the party's promise to scrap corporate tax cuts, said Finance Minister Dwight Duncan."

Speaker, when we tabled a motion in December, not so long ago, when this House last sat before the Christmas break, we called for a halt to further corporate tax cuts. That's what our motion said, and here's what Ontario's Liberal Party president—and the Ottawa Centre MPP—said to our motion: "The motion that is being presented by the NDP ... is going to harm Ontario's economy in these tough economic times. It is not going to help in terms of creation of new jobs. I really urge all members to vote against this motion, because what we need to do at this moment is to ensure that Ontario is a good place to do business."

Countless, countless, countless times, the Liberals called our proposals to stop the corporate tax cuts "job-killing." Now they appear to send signals that they're going to follow our lead and actually freeze the corporate taxes. Now, I welcome that. The Premier and the finance minister are suggesting that corporate tax giveaways are not a priority now. Well, I agree with that; in fact, I don't think they should have been a priority for quite some time.

But why was it a priority for the Liberal government to do this, to cut corporate taxes, when Ontario's deficit was at \$20 billion? Why was it a priority to cut corporate taxes when families struggling to pay the bills weren't getting the help they needed? Why was it a priority to cut corporate taxes when local emergency rooms were being closed in the province of Ontario? In fact, it wasn't that long ago that the Liberals themselves were railing at the Conservatives over their planned corporate tax cuts. Over 70 times in this Legislature, Speaker, the Premier criticized the Conservatives' corporate tax cuts. He called them reckless, he called them irresponsible—and it was the Conservative government at the time that put the brakes on corporate tax cuts. I have to say we've certainly come full circle, wouldn't you think?

The fact is that Ontario's corporate tax rates are ultra-competitive, and they were ultra-competitive even before the recent cuts that this Liberal government has been implementing started to take place.

1610

You know what? Our corporate tax rates are lower than 50 states in the United States. They're 10% lower than most of the Great Lakes states that surround us and who are our direct competitors. Don't take that from us.

Don't take that from me. It was a key point in this government's 2008 budget. That was one of their key factors in their budget documents.

In 2011, a PricewaterhouseCoopers study said that Canada's corporate income tax rates were well below those of the US, below those of Australia, below those of Finland, of France, Germany, India, Italy, Korea, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland and the UK, among others. Speaker, ours were lower. Now, we have a recent OECD study that ranks Canada's combined corporate income tax rates 10 points below the United States and Japan.

The reality is that as we drive down corporate taxes, we are not getting anything for it. We're not getting jobs, and we are not getting investment. In fact, I've heard the Premier rue so many times already the fact that investment simply does not seem to be coming to Ontario, and that's with a number of percentage points shaved off, from 14% down to 11.5%, of the corporate tax rate. It is a strategy that has not worked for jobs. It is a strategy that has not worked for investment. It is a strategy that has helped to cobble our revenue stream, however.

If the billions that federal and provincial governments have spent on corporate tax giveaways were actually working to create jobs, there wouldn't be 600,000 Ontarians out of a job right now and investment wouldn't be declining in this province.

You know, the HST and lower corporate income tax rates have transferred roughly \$10 billion into the corporate sector from our treasury, on top of all of the corporate tax handouts from the federal government as well. Ontario families have paid the price through higher taxes on the basics. There is little evidence to show that they have worked to create jobs or stimulate investment, as I've said. Investment, in fact, as a share of GDP in this province has declined steadily in the past decade from 8% down to 6%.

Do you know what's happening to the dollars that are going to the corporations, Speaker? The one thing that is increasing, the one thing that is making a difference in Ontario—the cash reserves of the corporate sector are increasing significantly. Cash reserves are increasing significantly. That's what we have to show for our largesse in our corporate tax cuts in this province. They're taking the money that the treasury badly needs and they're stashing it away in reserves, and we're not benefiting at all from that. Ontarians are not benefiting one iota. Our economy is not benefiting, and workers are not benefiting. Families are not benefiting.

Instead of investing, corporations are sitting on record levels of cash. Non-financial corporations had \$477 billion in cash reserves in the second quarter of 2011. That's up 200% from a decade earlier and an astonishing 750% from two decades earlier. Something is not right with this equation. Why do we keep giving these corporations more and more tax cuts when they're simply shovelling that money into their cash reserves? It is absolutely the wrong thing to do.

The heart of the problem is that there's absolutely no incentive for companies to use this money to make in-

vestments, no incentive whatsoever. They can do anything that they want with the money they get in their corporate tax cuts. They could create jobs, but they don't have to create jobs. They could invest, but they don't have to invest. Over the past 10 years, they have done neither; they have not invested and they have not created jobs. They're not creating jobs, they're not investing, and they haven't done any of that since this government started yet another round of corporate tax cuts in this province.

You know, we're not the only ones who are arguing that these tax cuts haven't led to more investment or more productivity. I'm not the only one who is saying that. Here's what Don Drummond concluded in his recent paper. He wrote the following: "For many years the author believed that Canada's weak productivity performance reflected inappropriate public policy. Despite most of the public policy agenda that was put forward to improve productivity being implemented, productivity growth in this country since 2000 has actually deteriorated. This suggests that the private sector bears more responsibility for Canada's productivity malaise than previous thought."

Well, eureka, Mr. Drummond. Thank you for letting us know something that has been as plain as the nose on all of our faces for quite some time. Yet this motion simply follows along a path that gets us to nowhere, a path that gets us as a province to nowhere, a path that gets families to nowhere, a path that gets people who are looking for work to nowhere, a path that gets the desire for more investment in Ontario to nowhere, a path that gets our treasury to nowhere, a path that gets our public services to nowhere, a path that gets our deficit reduction process to nowhere. Speaker, it's a path to nowhere. New Democrats have known it's a path to nowhere for years and years and years. The Liberals used to believe that, then they didn't believe it anymore. Now maybe they're starting to believe it again.

The evidence is clear: This motion should not be supported. New Democrats will not support it. Corporate tax cuts do nothing for Ontario, and they must be stopped.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Mississauga—Streetsville.

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** Thank you, Speaker. As I begin, I considered a point of order pursuant to standing order number 14. I considered seeking the Speaker's opinion on whether today's opposition motion is in order, based on one or either of two criteria. The first was standing order 23(f). It is arguable that today's opposition day motion reflects on the deferred vote on the motion for third reading of Bill 162, an act respecting budget measures—May 27, 2009—on which the House has already voted, and the credibility of the opposition Conservatives, who now advocate a budget measure which on that occasion in 2009 they opposed. The second is standing order 23(e) and whether today's opposition day motion anticipates the Budget Measures Act later this spring.

Now, Speaker, I'm not going to ask for that point of order.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: This opposition day motion to which the member is speaking now has already been approved by the table. They've gone through the checkpoints. They've gone through the checklist. If he wants to go on and talk about this, so be it, but we've got a serious issue before this House, and that's what we should be discussing, not some kind of a game from the member from Mississauga–Streetsville.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Thank you. I don't consider—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Can I have your attention, please?

I don't consider that a point of order. I also believe that he is tinkering on whether he wants to call a point of order or not; we're not quite sure. I would suggest that we get to the meat of the issue. If you do want to call a point of order, by all means do it. Thank you.

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** Thank you, Speaker. My colleague seems to have jumped the gun because, as I said, although it is arguably a point of order, I am not going to call that point of order. Here's why: I'm a Liberal, and no matter how wacky, how unworkable, how ideologically motivated a matter brought before this House is, I think it should at least be heard, and I think this matter should at least be heard. So I will not ask the Speaker's opinion—

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I'm not a Progressive Conservative—not even close—but I consider “wacky” an unparliamentary term, in referring to a motion before the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** I'll rule on that as a bit of a stretch. We'll appreciate it if that word isn't used again, but I will not ask you to withdraw that.

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** Thank you very much, Speaker. At one time I lived in a province where that word referred to by the member was the nickname of the Premier.

We realize there is no substance and possibly even less merit to this motion, but it will be instructive to debate it today.

1620

Let's start by pointing out the members here today who will presumably vote in favour of corporate tax cuts in today's opposition motion and who voted against it in 2009. They would be the members from Wellington–Halton Hills, Sarnia–Lambton, Haldimand–Norfolk, Halton, Simcoe North, Oxford, Dufferin–Caledon, York–Simcoe, Durham, Oshawa, Kitchener–Waterloo and Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke. Now, Speaker, whether these members stand up and vote—unless they choose to abstain—they need to consider whether their vote is either breaking a promise or merely doing a normal, ordinary, everyday Conservative flip-flop.

The members opposite, Speaker, advocate choking off the supply of financial oxygen to the 13 million of us in Ontario during a time when the rest of the world is simply not buying as much from us as it once did. Ontar-

ians disagree with them. The Conservatives would have the province withdraw money from all of us and give it to people who are either flush with cash and are not asking for more of it, or whose business volume is not generating much taxable income and therefore a corporate tax cut is of no value to them.

In this spirit, Speaker, I would call the attention of the official opposition to an enlightening article in today's Toronto Star business pages—the business pages. It is entitled, “Why Incompetent People Are Too Incompetent to Know They're Incompetent.”

To recap, Speaker, when we vent the steam and strip away the frothy rhetoric on today's motion, we are left with this:

(1) The House has already voted on this measure, and on that occasion, the Conservatives voted against the corporate tax cut they advocate today;

(2) The potential beneficiaries of the flip-flop tax cut advocated by the Conservatives are either not asking for it or likely couldn't use it even if it were enacted;

(3) To Conservatives, right-wing ideology trumps good, solid common sense every time.

Now, Speaker, as finance ministers in Conservative governments in Ontario, Janet Ecker and Jim Flaherty, in their day, postponed tax reductions when prevailing market conditions suggested it would be the prudent, sensible and far-sighted thing to do. How will Ontario then deal with the current challenges and emerge, as we traditionally do from challenging economic times, stronger when we come out than we were when we went in? We have a signature document that spells out the answer to that question each year: It is the annual Ontario budget.

Perhaps today's opposition day motion is a belated act of contrition from the regressive convertibles saying publicly that they should have voted for the Ontario budget in 2009 when they had the chance.

In Ontario households, like the ones I represent in Lisgar, Meadowvale and Streetsville that sent me here, families and businesses don't float on ever-expanding income and march from success to success. We have tough times, and it brings out the best in us. We look at ways of doing what we do faster, smarter, less expensively and more efficiently. We look for things that we've never done before. We try new things. We search for higher values. We change, and we make choices. And if our best intentions before circumstances changed would lead us over a cliff, we don't say to our families, to our employees, our suppliers, and our lenders, “Well, once my mind is made up, reality has to conform to me and not us to reality.”

And so, for the lifelong PC supporters who voted for me three times in a row, they know and respect that, and I'll earn that fourth vote by how I and our government make thoughtful, prudent and intelligent choices, not how we cling to an inflexible, unworkable and ultimately unsuccessful ideology, in a manner advocated by this opposition day motion today. Thank you very much, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Thornhill.

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** Thank you very much, Speaker.

You know, I share only one thought with the member from Mississauga–Streetsville. I, too, have to ask myself the question: Are you actually here in a bizarre world, a reverse world, where you actually have to file a motion to try to hold the Liberal government of Dalton McGuinty to its own promises, 13 weeks after it renewed those promises? That's what we're here for. We don't want to file a motion like this. We just want those people to do what they said they were going to do.

As recently as November, the Premier himself said they planned to continue on the path of tax cuts and bring things down to 10%. Here we are saying, "Well, keep your promises," and I'm listening to nonsense like this.

What is it exactly that this party hates so much about doing business in Ontario? What is it that they don't understand? Do you think that business is some big iron monster that chews people up and spits them out, or do you think that business is what I think business is? Do you think that business maybe creates economic activity? Maybe business is an association of people who produce goods and services for the betterment of us all, for consumption by us all, so that we can all participate in that economic activity and have some degree of prosperity. That's what you indicated, and we agreed with, when you said you were going to stimulate business by bringing the corporate tax rate down.

Now that you've done a complete turnaround in the course of two or three months because you want to keep your house together, you want to keep your house in order, we are here debating this motion. That's shameful.

The fact of the matter is that the business of Ontario is about the business of everybody, and right now in Ontario what we have is a situation where our unemployment rate is going into the 62nd consecutive month of being the laggard of Confederation, the highest in the country, 8.1%.

Ontario has one of the highest corporate tax rates in Canada: 4.5% at the lower rate; 12% at the higher rate. I wonder how many people who are looking in on this, this afternoon, realize that only one province has higher corporate tax rates. It's New Brunswick. Prince Edward Island is at 1%; Newfoundland and Labrador, 4%; British Columbia, 2.5%; Manitoba, under an NDP government, has a corporate tax rate, at the lower end, of nil.

In the first quarter of this year, guess what Manitoba did? Manitoba had an unemployment rate of 5.4%, the second-lowest among all provinces. So if you want to compare one against the other, that's what you want to do.

Under this government in the province of Ontario, we have lost over 300,000 manufacturing jobs. We have debt of \$250 billion. We have a projected deficit, by your own economist, of \$30 billion coming up within the next five fiscal years, by 2017-18, and an accumulated debt, by that time, of \$411 billion.

Unemployment in Ontario, as mentioned, is at 8.1% compared to, say, Alberta at 4.9%. The national average

is 7.6%. And the consumer price index, which really combines all of the things that are staples—food and clothing and shelter—has gone up about 10% over the course of the last five years. That's shameful as well. Ontario's projected economic growth rate for 2011 is 2.7%, slowing to 2.3%, and Drummond is talking about 2%.

We have to get away from this. Eight years of spending later, the government hires an economist to tell them what to do. Isn't it a fact that a government is elected to govern and figure out what to do itself and not reverse itself in midstream? That's what the subject of this motion is. Dalton McGuinty basically created a fire, and now he wants to be a fireman. You cannot have it both ways.

There are 362 recommendations from economist Don Drummond, and the instructions are clear: take the 362 recommendations in concert, follow them or tell us what you're going to put back on the table when you take one of them off the table. That's not what you're doing, and please do not mistake us for saying that you should adopt them all. Just tell us what it is you're going to do. The bottom line is that you need a plan. You can't keep making it up as you go along.

We need to encourage business to set up in Ontario and stay in Ontario. We need to create jobs in Ontario. We need to continue with the planned corporate tax cuts that are the subject of this particular motion. We need to attract business. We need to attract investment. The planned reductions in the corporate tax rate would create an estimated 600,000 jobs. Isn't it more than passing strange that that's the number of people who are unemployed in Ontario now?

I implore each and every one of you, regardless of what your party affiliation is, to reconsider getting back on track with what we voted for, with what you proposed in your last budget, and make sure that the corporate tax rates go through. Thank you, Speaker.

1630

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Trinity–Spadina.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Thank you very much, Speaker. I'm going to be speaking against this motion with as much vigour as I can muster. I await with excitement to see how many Liberals are going to be opposing this particular motion.

I was in committee while our leader spoke on this, but I know that she had some juicy quotes from the Liberals about what they used to say when we said that cutting corporate taxes is the wrong thing to do. And there was a time when the Premier of Ontario used to agree with us. I quoted him in a speech about a couple of days ago when I did my lead on another bill.

It's, of course, with great humour that you read these things, because Liberals have this incredible proclivity to go back and forth on positions willy-nilly, and they don't feel bad about doing it, as I heard from the member from Mississauga–Streetsville. Every time they have to change

a position, they simply say, “Well, we need to be practical.”

So at one point McGuinty said that if we cut corporate taxes we're going to lose jobs, we're going to have to cut in the hospital sector, we're going to have to cut in education, and no way Dalton McGuinty was going to do that—a mere couple of years ago. Then, lo and behold, he changes his position and says, “We are committed to corporate tax cuts because we believe, as the Tories do, that it creates jobs.”

Then I hear from the member from Mississauga—Streetsville that we are about to get a change of a Liberal position once again. You guys, how do you deal with it? How do you handle it? How do you sleep? It seems to me that you guys need some psychiatric help on this file. There's an issue of balance and it's not any other balance than mental balance. So I urge you to find a way to deal with this particular disequilibrium that you're experiencing on a regular basis. Good doctor, you know what I'm talking about.

And so when I hear Liberal quotes from a while past: “What the NDP want to do is to create jobs in Alberta,” Minister of Finance, 2/11; “The Ontario NDP plan will kill jobs,” the Minister of Finance says; “Ontarians know a vote for the NDP means killing jobs”—just but a few quotes that I know our leader mentioned and others will when I'm done.

But that sounds a bit like what the Tories are saying today and every day, because these are the market fundamentalists. There was a time when many of you good Liberals seemed to agree. It appears that in the next couple of months, you're going to change your mind again. You're killing me. You're killing me and I'm worried about you. I'm worried about your health. Reassure me that you're all okay when next you speak on the matter, through you, Speaker.

Look, we know that this is—speaking to the Tories, and to Libs—growth without jobs. We have had tremendous growth in the last 15 years and the jobs have not been proportionate to the corporate tax cuts that we have been giving them, both federally and provincially, and you know it, at least those of you who are reading some deeper books other than the occasional—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Willowdale, when he enters the chamber, will acknowledge the Chair. Thank you.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** So we know—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** I'll repeat that. When the member from Willowdale enters the chamber, I'd appreciate an acknowledgement of the Chair. Thank you.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Just throw him out. It would be easier.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** I'll give you one warning. There's fun and then there's mockery. Don't mock the Chair or you'll be gone.

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** Thank you. Take your seat.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** What I want to say to the market fundamentalists—and we find many in the Tory caucus and in the Liberal caucus—is that they've got this all wrong. We have seen growth without jobs and we have seen growth without working men and women benefiting from that growth.

I want to refer to some of the stats on this file, but before I do and before I comment on some of the other stuff, I want to quote Bill Currie and Elliot Morris, who have done some research on the whole matter of investments. The idea is that when we cut corporate taxes, corporations will make investments in machinery and in R&D. We haven't been seeing that in the last 15 years.

These two folks, Bill Currie and Elliot Morris—one is the vice-chairman of Deloitte Canada and the other is Deloitte's American managing director, Elliot Morris; they're senior consultants at Deloitte—they say, “In the survey, Canadian executives indicated that they are not planning to invest in the types of activities required to improve productivity. When we look at the actual decisions Canadian business leaders make about activities that bolster productivity, such as investing in R&D and commercializing innovation, Americans are 13% more tolerant of risk than Canadians,” according to that study.

They say, “Canadian business leaders' aversion to risk is especially important because it underlies other critical contributors to our growing productivity gap, including a lack of risk capital for start-ups, chronic underinvestment in machinery and equipment, insufficient investment of private sector R&D and an unwillingness to engage in international markets.”

Now, this is stuff that ought to concern most of that Conservative caucus back here and the others, because that's your argument. Your argument is: Cut corporate taxes, and they will invest. Right? The study that I just referred to you—these are your friends, by the way; I wish they were mine. They don't give me any money. Your friends are saying, “It's not happening.”

Now, you're either listening to this, or reading it, or not. My suspicion is that you'd rather avoid those facts if it doesn't fit your narrative. My point is the following—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Is it time? Good heavens, we're running out of time.

The corporate taxes this government is giving are going to the banks and the insurance companies: \$500 million going to the banks, \$130 million going to the insurance companies. These boys and women are making huge amounts of money in their salaries, over \$10 million each, some a bit less. How do you live with that kind of money and feel good? Where is the job creation?

*Interjection:* They fund these campaigns.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Other than the money that they get to help Tories and Liberals with these tax policies.

I am looking forward—because I'm running out of time, and my friends want to speak to this—to the debate

from the Liberals. I want to know where they stand on this today. It's going to be entertaining, I am sure.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Peterborough.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I'm pleased to be able to participate in this debate this afternoon. The motion proposed by the leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition reminds me of—I was doing a little research this afternoon. Back in 1957, Lionel Chevrier, who was then the opposition House leader for the Liberals in Ottawa, moved a motion on a particular matter. The Right Honourable Prime Minister John George Diefenbaker, who was born in Neustadt, Ontario, thundered—

*Applause.*

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Some applause there for Neustadt. The Right Honourable John George Diefenbaker thundered a response: "Big game hunters are never fooled by little rabbit tracks."

Mr. Speaker, I'll take the opportunity to try to explain that to the members opposite. This is an interesting, well-couched motion, but what does it intend to do this afternoon? It is intended to reveal what our measures might be in the upcoming budget in late March.

1640

We all know that the principle of budget secrecy is still important to this Parliament and to all Legislatures across this country. Indeed, it's a very important principle that has always been followed by Ministers of Finance in Ottawa and provincial treasurers right across this great Dominion.

I want to reflect on some additional research, Mr. Speaker. It was about a Chancellor of the Exchequer in Great Britain from 1945 to 1947. His name was Edward Hugh Neale Dalton. He was the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the Prime Minister of Great Britain, who was then Clement Attlee. I want to quote what happened in this particular instance about budget initiatives and budget secrecy.

"On 12 November 1947 the chancellor opened his fourth budget, seen as an emergency measure against inflation. Ironically, this final Dalton budget has come to be regarded as a pioneering initiative, which for the first time fully incorporated Keynesian principles, providing a model for the subsequent 'austerity' budgets of Sir Stafford Cripps. As it turned out," the Chancellor of the Exchequer "was not at the Treasury to see the effects of the new approach. Walking through the lobby on his way to deliver the budget speech, he was approached by a reporter on the London evening Star who stopped him and asked a question. The chancellor replied precisely, giving details of the main tax changes he was about to announce. The reporter immediately telephoned his editor, and copies of the Star containing the information in the stop-press section were" made available "before the chancellor had reached the relevant part of his speech. There was no movement on the stock exchange attributable to this leak, which the opposition accepted was no more than a regrettable accident. However, Dalton's position had been weakened over preceding

months. Some colleagues had come to regard him as a liability, and he had unwisely become involved in a Cripps-led manoeuvre aimed at persuading the Prime Minister to stand down. Dalton's offer of resignation was accepted, and his career as a front-line minister" in the Attlee government "came to an end."

The reason I reference this is, as I said in my opening, that this motion today is a very clever attempt to get some insight into our budget, which we plan to present toward the latter part of March.

*Interjection.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member for Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Well, maybe he should take the opportunity to learn a bit of the history of this particular Chancellor of the Exchequer, because it's very informative.

In fact, over the last number of months, we're getting advice from all sectors. We're getting advice from the Drummond commission. We're getting advice from individuals that you and I meet, Mr. Speaker, in our constituency offices to provide us advice.

Interestingly enough, about four weeks ago at a round table town hall with Ian Howcroft and the Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters, bringing together a wide variety of business interests in the Peterborough area, they told me that the number one problem in terms of manufacturing, particularly in Ontario and indeed in Quebec, was the rapid appreciation of the Canadian dollar that went from 63 cents in the early 1990s and rapidly appreciated to parity and above parity, which we've all witnessed over the last number of years.

What he clearly indicated to me, while he recognized that our government has made some changes on the corporate tax side, was that the real challenge for manufacturers was how to respond to a rapidly appreciating currency, an increase that they never, ever had to cope with before. In fact, in northern Ontario particularly, the challenge with the forestry industry has been the rapid appreciation of the Canadian dollar. Everybody who takes some time to drill down into the issues we're talking about will find out that that's been a particular challenge.

We've brought in some measures to try to address that through HST, through bringing about a more competitive tax structure in this province. But, you know, we'll provide a number of initiatives in the budget we'll present, traditionally in the last week of March, prior to the fiscal year-end.

Look, I recognize this motion for what it is. The opposition wants to get some insight—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** It appears that the members of the official opposition are not listening to the speaker. We're hoping that you'll understand my warning—last warning. Thank you.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for bringing back some order in the House.

As we've been doing since October 6, in the months leading up to the election and after the election and as we get ready to present the budget in March, we'll be consulting with a wide variety of people, as, Mr. Speaker, you'll be doing in your riding in Hamilton East-Stoney Creek. In a minority Parliament, it's a great opportunity for all these good ideas that are generated by groups within one's constituency, or indeed on an individual basis, to come forward and to present all these ideas to the treasurer, my colleague the Honourable Dwight Duncan, and we'll take those all into consideration as we get ready to present our budget.

Indeed, we've introduced a number of programs to make our businesses more competitive. In eastern Ontario we have the eastern Ontario development fund, and I want to take an opportunity to talk about that for a moment this afternoon, because it fits into how we can make our manufacturers more competitive.

We've had some great success in the riding of Peterborough—some 12 companies, ranging from a multinational corporation like Siemens, going to companies that were developed and nurtured right in Peterborough. I think of McCloskey Brothers, which builds trolleys for the aggregate industry. They export right around the world.

I want to take the opportunity to talk about Flying Colours. Flying Colours is a great company. The EODF supported it—John Gillespie and his family. In fact, at the end of October, we were delighted to host the Right Honourable Stephen Harper, Prime Minister of Canada, to visit the Peterborough airport, along with Premier McGuinty—the opportunity to look at what goes on at Flying Colours.

Mr. Speaker, just to let you know what Flying Colours does, it takes brand new executive jets from Bombardier in Montreal and it retrofits those jets to meet clients' needs. On that particular day when the Prime Minister and the Premier were both there—the Prime Minister came into Peterborough airport with his new Challenger aircraft and had all the entourage there with him, and we gave him a very warm and substantial Peterborough welcome on that beautiful fall day. What happens is, these jets arrive at Peterborough from Bombardier, and they're outfitted with the latest technology for clients right around the world. In fact, on that day when the Prime Minister and the Premier were there, we had four jets that were being retrofitted: two from India and two from China. This is a real opportunity for an Ontario company, a Canadian company, to develop business in two large emerging markets. They certainly indicated, both the Prime Minister and the Premier, on that particular day that the investments from the EODF in terms of acquiring the latest technology in order for them to achieve their productivity targets was the way to go.

Mr. Speaker, I see my time is up, but I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to chat on this motion this afternoon.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Whitby—Oshawa.

**Mrs. Christine Elliott:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to join the debate on this important motion today. It is so important because of the grim economic situation that Ontario is in, thanks to eight-plus years of the McGuinty government's out-of-control spending, lack of accountability and fiscal mismanagement. It's so bad, we have a \$16-billion deficit here in Ontario that's expected to go up to \$30 billion by 2017-18 if we don't take action now. In fact, Mr. Don Drummond, whose report was just released a week or so ago, said exactly that. He said, "Decisive, firm and early action is required to get off this slippery, and ultimately destructive, slope. At a time when the news is full of stories of countries around the world that have failed the fiscal test and slid into the ditch, to the enormous detriment of their citizens, Ontario must be different. It must be the best." Mr. Speaker, we in the PC Party agree.

**1650**

Of course, Don Drummond only had a mandate to deal with government spending, but that's only one half of the equation. The other half is, what do we need to do to rescue our economy and bring Ontario back to its rightful place as the job creation capital of Canada? These are serious issues that are growing ever more urgent by the day because we have international credit agencies like Moody's, like the Dominion Bond Rating Service, that are literally breathing down our necks, waiting and watching to see what the McGuinty government is going to do about this financial mess that we're in.

And what have we heard from the McGuinty government to date? Nothing, absolutely nothing. In fact, it's even worse than nothing because it now looks like they're going to backtrack on their previous promise to cut back corporate tax rates here in the province of Ontario.

Just going back a few years, the federal government proposed a few years ago to work with the province of Ontario to lower our corporate tax rates here in the province to get to a combined rate of 25%, the federal government's share being 15%, the Ontario government's share being 10%. This was something that the McGuinty government agreed to and started work on. But now, all signs point to the McGuinty government stalling on the final tax reductions from 11.5% to 10%. Why is this so important? Unlike what other speakers have said, it's not because we want to give corporations and their executives special privileges and breaks. It's because we all know it's one of the most important factors in determining where businesses are going to locate, along with other factors, including a skilled workforce, lack of regulation and red tape, and energy policies. Of course, we could speak about those; that's another motion for another day.

Obviously we want businesses to locate here in Ontario because our unemployment rate right now is so appalling. It currently stands at 8.1% and has been higher than the national average for over five years, thanks to this government. We currently have about 600,000

people in the province of Ontario who are unemployed, and they're looking for their government to help them. The fact is, nothing is happening, and we're not alone. Ontario is under intense competition with other jurisdictions in order to attract businesses. Other countries are looking to do the same thing.

Just last week, President Obama announced that he would be asking Congress to scrub the corporate tax code of dozens of loopholes and subsidies to reduce the top rate to 28%, down from 35%, while giving preferences to manufacturers that would set the maximum effective rate at 25%.

An article in the *Guardian* from February 2011 noted, "Over the last 20 years, corporation tax has increasingly been used as a weapon in the global battle to attract investment from footloose multinationals." Well, Mr. Speaker, the competition isn't just international; it's domestic as well. Both British Columbia and Alberta have provincial corporate tax rates set at 10%, and I don't think it's—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** I don't know if members have trouble listening. That's the second member that has walked in in the last three minutes and has not acknowledged the Chair. I don't know how many times I have to stand up and say it.

The overall process here—we're trying to bring decorum back to the House. This has been talked about with other Speakers and it's been a real challenge, to say the least, this week. I hope things improve, because we're certainly not happy with the way things are going right now.

Thank you.

**Mrs. Christine Elliott:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying, both British Columbia and Alberta have provincial corporate tax rates set at 10%, and I don't think it's any coincidence that they also have much lower rates of unemployment than does Ontario.

Low corporate tax rates are also important for existing businesses in Ontario because they can then invest more in things like machinery and equipment, particularly in high technology equipment and software. According to the Institute for Competitiveness and Prosperity, in its report for 2011 entitled *Canada's Innovation Imperative*, it was stated that, "Tax reform in Canada will provide a boost to business investment, which in turn will improve our innovation and prosperity." That, Mr. Speaker, will help all Ontarians.

Now more than ever we need to continue with our planned corporate tax rate reductions. As recently as November 2011, Premier McGuinty knew that when he said, "These corporate tax cuts are in fact having an impact on the front lines. They will mean more jobs."

Well, Premier McGuinty, nothing has changed. Don't lose your nerve now. Too much is at stake. I urge all members of this House to vote for this motion.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paul Miller):** The member from Bramalea–Gore–Malton.

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** Mr. Speaker, let me begin first with the Liberal Party. I don't take issue with back-

tracking. I don't take issue with listening to the input of other parties. In fact, I respect that this party—I respect that my honourable colleagues are listening or heeding good advice. My concern is this: that when the party takes an irrational partisanship approach to an issue, when they remark at a suggestion and they say, "This is a job killer. This is a completely thoughtless idea," they ruin their own credibility. They ruin their own credibility when they take a pre-emptive approach to an idea which they're now supporting. So my question is, Mr. Speaker, can this party come down on a position? Can they take a stance? Can they have an opinion that they can stick to without backtracking again and again?

Mr. Drummond's report talks about cutting spending. It talks about cutting services. What does this mean? What does this really mean to the people of Ontario? This means that education is at risk. This means our child care is at risk. This means services like hospitals, care for our elders—these are at risk.

We all know that there are tough economic times. Why is it that when times are tough, we put all the pressure, we put all the burden on those families that need the most help? Why do we put the pressure, why do we put the burden of sacrifice during this tough or difficult economic time on working families, on those that are not the best off? Why can't we approach this problem in a more fair and equitable way?

Let's look at sharing the burden. And who can share the burden the best? It's corporations. Corporations are in the best position to share this burden.

Now, we're not talking about killing jobs here; we're talking about an effective strategy to create jobs. What's an effective strategy to create jobs? Let's look at the track record of what corporate tax rates have done in this province. The history is very clear: Corporate tax rates in Ontario have gone down consistently, have gone down over the track record of this province. But what has increased over the track record of this province? Unemployment rates. What else has happened? We have lost manufacturing jobs. So simply decreasing corporate tax rates has not increased jobs for Ontarians. Why would we continue on a path that simply does not work? It doesn't make sense.

Let's look at Manitoba's model. An honourable colleague mentioned that Manitoba has a zero per cent corporate tax rate. In fact, they don't have a zero per cent corporate tax rate; they have a zero per cent tax rate on small businesses. In Ontario, we have a 14% general corporate tax rate; we have a 5.5% tax rate on small businesses. Who creates jobs in Ontario? Who creates jobs in Canada? Small businesses. Now, if we had a focused approach to job creation, we would address small businesses and look at assisting them, assisting those who actually create jobs in Ontario, and not corporations who, when they receive corporate tax rates, what they do with that is increase their cash reserves. This evidence is very clear. It's very clear that if you increase or decrease corporate tax rates, corporations simply increase their reserves on hand. They increase the reserves that they

hold. That doesn't mean that they're going to create more jobs. So the solution here is not proceeding down a path that we've seen before that hasn't worked; the solution here is creating a new path, a path that really helps Ontarians.

We have to look at who we represent. As elected officials, we represent the people of Ontario, not the corporations of Ontario. We represent the people who are working in factories and offices, who are skilled tradespeople, who are working as skilled professionals. The people of Ontario deserve legislation which protects their interests, which protects their lives, not the lives and the livelihood of corporations.

1700

Now, we believe in rewarding corporations who exhibit good civic partnership, who exhibit good citizenship, who exhibit a commitment to improving Ontario. So if you invest in Ontario, if you invest in the infrastructure, if you create factories, if you produce jobs in Ontario, then you deserve a corporate tax rate. Let's tie; let's create an incentive; let's make it worthwhile for corporations to create jobs here. It simply doesn't make sense to give money without any guarantee. We've seen what has happened to Caterpillar in London. When you receive money without any guarantee, you look for another place where you can make more money. That doesn't create a better province. That doesn't create jobs in Ontario.

Now, as the gap widens between the rich and the poor, it's our job to ensure we create a more equitable province, and that doesn't mean assisting in this gap and assisting in it widening. We must recognize that the solution lies in creating a true mechanism for creating jobs in Ontario, and this increase in corporate tax giveaways will not present a solution that will help Ontario.

So I ask the Liberal Party to recall their previous words and to reflect on them, to reflect on their stance when the NDP presented a solid argument, a sound argument, that corporate tax rates in the face of an economic downturn, in the face of difficult times for families, were not the proper solution, and that they apologize for taking that stance and now admit that they're heeding the proper advice of our party, heeding the proper advice of the party committed to the people of this province.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities.

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** Mr. Speaker, it's amazing that anyone in the opposition can have a straight face today. Here is a party opposite—let me just go through the list—that was quite happy—

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** You're killing me.

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** I'm not talking about you guys. I'm talking about the boys in blue and the girls in blue.

They were happy with a corporate tax rate 18% higher than the Liberal government's, Mr. Speaker. They supported, quite frankly, a business surtax on small business, which they were completely comfortable with. And, in

both cases, when we presented those tax cuts, what did the Tories do? They voted against lower taxes.

When we reduced corporate income tax over the last eight years by \$12 billion, what did the Tories do? They voted against lower taxes.

When we reduced property taxes for seniors by \$1 billion, what did the Tories do? The Tories voted against lower taxes for seniors.

When we worked with the auto sector and put \$4.8 billion with the federal Conservatives to save the auto sector and get 9,000 jobs and save 400,000, the Tories voted against the auto sector—again.

How do you stand up and give us lectures on economic development and have a credible plan? Really. You have a tweak on ratios, and you have a job freeze. Would you at least go talk to Mr. Flaherty, who actually understands economics?

Ever since Clement and Baird and Flaherty left, there's no one left in that caucus who can count.

This is just hysterical, Mr. Speaker: 90,000 low-income—

*Interjection.*

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** I'm sorry, Madam.

Ninety thousand low-income Ontarians: We took them off the tax roll. We eliminated all taxes for 90,000. What did the Tories do? They voted against lower taxes and no taxes for low-income people.

How you guys present—you will not raise taxes. The last budget you in government voted for, when you were last in power, was your last budget. You raised corporate income taxes. Your last time you had a chance to vote on this side of the House, you did the exact opposite of what you're talking about today: You voted to raise corporate and income taxes. Now what do some of the star-struck leaders over there to have say about that, Mr. Speaker?

The then finance minister pleaded with the House, saying, "Oh, my lord." But what we have done in this budget, as we said clearly, is to take a look at the difficult choices we faced here in Ontario because of the significant economic downturn. We have delayed some of the tax cuts for one year, which just helps in the total picture to meet the priorities we felt were most important for the people of Ontario.

That could have been the member for Thornhill, but no, it was Janet Ecker, our then Minister of Finance. What did Jim Flaherty, then the Minister of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation, have to say about delaying and raising taxes? On June 19, 2002, he said, in defence of the delayed corporate income tax, "This was a year in which—like last year actually—in which there were some difficult decisions to be made." And if you think that all the birds have flown the coop, Mr. Speaker, and that none of the people who hold this point of view—let's quote the member for Oxford, who still sits in the front row over there: "I'm sure you are now all aware of our plan, introduced in the 2002 Ontario budget by the Minister of Finance"—Janet Ecker—"to delay by one year certain currently scheduled tax cuts.... These proposed delays are a prudent response"—prudent

response—"to Ontario's current fiscal economic situation...."

"There is a need to address the fiscal realities of today."

While you were in a global economic boom, you managed to create a \$5.6-billion deficit. Mr. Speaker, we have governed through the biggest global economic meltdown, when governments in Western Europe, previously stable, have now gone off the cliff. You have nothing to teach us. You should have a little humility, given your record.

I voted against the NDP motion. Why? Because what the NDP proposes is to increase corporate taxes in Ontario by \$9 billion. I agree with the leader of the third party: Part of the challenge right now is that our tax cuts have worked. This is what the Conservatives should learn from our friends in the NDP: Our corporations in Ontario have better cash reserves than they've probably had in 20 or 30 years.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Exactly.

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** "Absolutely," says the NDP finance critic, and I agree with him. Their solution in the NDP is to say, "This is a terrible thing. Let's take all the money back, because money is only best spent when it's in the public sector." So what are we doing?

*Interjections.*

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** You two, you sit so close to each other. Do the blue guys and the orange guys ever talk? I mean, really, you should be better friends.

So what's happening in Ontario, Mr. Speaker? The—

*Interjections.*

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** My friends in the NDP point out that in the United States the corporate tax rate is 10 points higher, and that's a problem because of what you don't want to talk about, which is the fact that there are trillions and trillions of US dollars stranded offshore. The US is trying to repatriate its own capital. The Conservatives, who should understand capital repatriation, can't even say it. I heard the Leader of the Opposition say the word "innovation" for the first time since I've sat in this House. We cannot have a high corporate tax rate because you'll end up with the US problem of unrepatriated capital.

Our challenge is innovation, Mr. Speaker. If you actually believed in innovation, why did you vote against the Ontario venture capital fund and our partnerships with Northleaf, which have put billions of dollars of risk capital? We need to recreate—risk capitalist problem. That's the challenge.

And how are we doing, Mr. Speaker? By working with your federal cousins, we have introduced the HST, which, Jim Flaherty and Prime Minister Harper have pointed out over and over and over again, has reduced the friction of investment in technology and has increased hiring. Let me just tell you a few things. Right now, as a result of the tax changes—and I want to commend Minister Flaherty, because what he did was he took off—

*Interjection.*

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** My dear friend from Hastings, etc.—

*Laughter.*

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Northumberland—Quinte West.

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** Quinte West; I'm sorry. I mean, the one thing my friend, Lou Rinaldi, understood was that—and he was a big supporter of this—when you reduce the sales taxes domestically in concert with the federal government taking taxes off foreign-made assembled parts, you increase investment in capital. I was, as Minister of Research and Innovation, in your constituency not once, not twice but three times to see the effects of that in three new companies that opened and expanded, creating about 2,000 jobs at last count—in your constituency. And the member would vote against it, cutting his own constituents' throats when it comes to job creation.

1710

We have added 260,000 places to our colleges and universities; 60,000 new apprenticeships, growing by 30,000 per year. Why? Part of our economic policy, which isn't a one-trick pony, stupid tax cut—it's actually a little more sophisticated.

Mr. Speaker, our goal is to have the most sophisticated, educated workforce in Ontario. They were happy with only half of Ontarians with an education. We have said "70%," and we're at 66%. We have a quarter of a million more Ontarians, when they apply to college, university or an apprenticeship, getting "yes." When they were in power, they got a "no." As a matter of fact, you didn't understand the innovation economy. You raised tuition 67% and cut our universities and colleges by half a billion. You almost dismantled it.

We have expanded colleges and universities and we have put in more incentives. We've put about a half a billion dollars, in partnership with the private sector, into risk capital for innovation. And what is the result of that, Mr. Speaker? The result of that, as my friend from Mississauga—Streetsville said, according to the federal government and the Kauffman report in the United States: We are one of the leading producers of what are called gazelles. These are 4.4% of all companies in Canada, which are producing over 40% of our jobs—40% of our jobs—which is about 321,000, the number they never talk about. That's what we're doing, Mr. Speaker. It's extraordinary.

Now, let me leave you with a challenge before I sit down: Come up with some smart ideas. Stop the one-trick pony. You think a 1% difference in the corporate tax rate is an economic policy. I'm not going to vote for anything you guys come up with until one party opposite actually tables an economic development plan that is something a little bit more than laughable. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member from Kitchener—Conestoga.

**Mr. Michael Harris:** Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to take this opportunity to address our leader's motion

calling on this government to continue with its planned reduction of the business tax rate to 10% by next year.

Coming from the private sector, I understand that businesses want and need clarity. Before businesses expand or look to new markets to invest and create jobs, they need to know that the long-term outlook in Ontario is stable. Part of that stability for businesses is ensuring the government won't unexpectedly raise taxes and put them at a competitive disadvantage with companies in other jurisdictions. But that is exactly what this government is about to do. Instead of implementing policies that will make Ontario one of the best places to invest, this government plans to do the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, cancelling a planned tax reduction is the same as increasing taxes, so it's time for the Premier to share with the majority in this place what that decision is.

There are nearly 600,000 Ontarians out of work today. We know that the last time this government hiked business taxes in 2004, the result was a staggering loss of 210,000 manufacturing jobs. What we in the PC caucus know is that a competitive corporate tax rate is the best way to help businesses in the short term and to create more jobs. Why? Because you attract investment with lower taxes, and when businesses pay less tax, they have more money to invest and create jobs here in Ontario.

The Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters are urging this government to stay the course on tax reforms in order to improve our competitive advantage and to once again make Ontario one of the best places to do business in Canada. But this government has simply responded with indifference as we continue to lag behind our competitors. The only people putting ideas on the table to turn things around in our province sit on this side of the House.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker: The PC caucus is committed to constructive, pro-growth policies like apprenticeship reform, affordable energy, eliminating the red tape and pressing the government to move forward on the planned reduction of the corporate tax rate.

I believe, with the right leadership, Ontario once again can be one of the best places to invest in Canada. So I will be supporting job creators in my riding of Kitchener—Conestoga and across Ontario by voting for this motion today. Thank you.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member from Beaches—East York.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I had to rush down here. We had our founding meeting of the estimates committee. I had to be there, so I missed some of the initial speakers, but I wanted to come and speak to this. I want to speak to this motion.

Every morning when I wake up I try to read a couple of newspapers and watch the CBC morning news to see what the markets are like around the world and try to keep on top of the whole financial sector. This morning, as I was watching the CBC news, the financial guru came on and was talking about how the Bank of Montreal had just posted its quarterly earnings of \$1.1 billion. Ordinarily, I would have thought: Well, here was a guy from

the financial sector saying, "What a wonderful thing." But then he looked into the camera and he asked all of the Canadians who were watching the program: "What is it exactly that the bank does to make this much money?"

He said, "I understand if it's a resource company. I even understand the oil company going out into Hibernia in all inclement weather, digging down, taking considerable risk to human life and everything else in order to find oil and reserves in order to make their money. I understand how they would want to do that."

He said, "But what is it exactly that the banks do for us? What is it exactly that makes it all well and good that they can make \$1.1 billion in a quarter—one single Canadian bank; not even the biggest one. What is it exactly they can do?" I thought, what a refreshing thing that was to watch on the CBC, because now people who are involved in the money market are starting to question all of this corporate greed. They're starting to question: What is it exactly they're doing to make this in excess of \$1-billion profit in a single quarter? We in the NDP have been thinking about this for awhile, but I was very surprised to see a kind of right-wing, conservative guy talking in this same language.

Over the past couple of weeks I've had the opportunity, in the absence of a working finance committee, to go to 10 towns and cities across Ontario and to speak with ordinary people about what they might want to see in the upcoming budget. Ordinarily that's done by the finance committee. I've had the opportunity in eight of the last 10 years to travel with the finance committee as we try to gauge public opinion about where taxes might be increased or decreased, where programs might be changed, the kinds of things that happen here every year at budget time. But in the absence, I had to go myself.

I met and had delegations of over 250 people in those 10 meetings, ordinary people who came forward with their ideas, their hopes and their dreams. I challenged each and every one of them in every meeting with the same three questions. I asked them first of all: "Tell me about the programs that you believe the government needs to continue and where changes in those programs might benefit ordinary people." The second question was: "What programs are no longer relevant? What programs do we not need to pay for and where can we save some money?" And the third one was: Somewhere in with all of this, we have to, as a government, come up and balance the books by 2017.

So there has to be a combination of some cuts of programs which are no longer relevant, if the public agrees with that. But also, we have to find other sources of revenue, just like every government has done for the last more than 100 years and every government that ever occupied this place has had to do—to look for those revenues.

I want to tell you, the ordinary people have a very balanced view of what needs to be done: 250 people came and made deputations with me and before me and all around me, and not one of them said that we should reduce corporate taxes. Not one out of 250 people agreed

with this motion that's being put forward by the Conservatives.

They came up with great ideas. They really want to protect our schools, colleges and universities. They really believe that our health care is something to be treasured. They are proud to be Ontarians and proud to be Canadians. They think that our health care is amongst the finest in the world and they don't want to tinker with it if it's going to be made worse.

They're worried about our environment and what the cost of cutting environmental services might be. They all remember Walkerton, and they don't want to go there.

1720

They talked in many places about transportation. They talked about the need for interconnecting cities and good roads, highways and railways, and they talked about not cutting out those things, because they rely on them to visit their friends or family or go to work.

What they did tell us was that there were ways to save money. Many, many of them talked about not spending as much money as we have in the past on acute care and hospitals, but to divert the money into long-term care or, even better still, keeping people in their own homes. They were very wise about this. They were talking about nurse practitioners. They were talking about having community health clinics. They were talking about the need to have birthing centres and midwifery. They knew all about this stuff.

Teachers and people came to us and said, "Don't cut our education. But if you have to find some money in education, don't take it from the classroom. If you need \$156 million that is only marginally being used, why don't you get rid of the EQAO?" And I have to question—all we do is we have teachers teach to the test, and then we have people run around and say, "My poor neighbourhood doesn't compete as well as the rich neighbourhood." You don't even need an EQAO to know who's going to be at the top of the list and who's going to be at the bottom. Everybody knows this. Even in my discussions with the finance minister, he knows in advance—as do all of you in your neighbourhood—which schools are going to be at the top and which ones are going to be at the bottom. The richer the neighbourhood, the higher up they are, and it has nothing to do with teachers teaching to the test. We don't need to spend \$156 million there.

They had talked about what do we need an Ontario Municipal Board for? Of all the useless institutions in this province, why do we spend money on such a useless thing? And then every single municipality has to hire lawyers and planners to go out and fight them when the developer—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Why not leave that authority with the municipality, like every other province? People are smart. They know you don't have to waste money, and that's another waste.

Where they were really smart was when I asked them, where are you going to find the money if you want to

maintain the programs that are dear to you? They came up with a whole bunch of things.

Of course, most of them agreed that we should cap the end of the corporate tax cuts; there should be no more. We're already lower than low. We don't need to go there. By stopping that, they said we would save between \$800 million and \$1 billion, and I agree with them. That's why I'm not voting for this motion.

They also talked about the health tax, the hated health levy that comes every year, and how that should be part of the income tax, because they think that people who earn a lot of money should be paying more; that it doesn't make much sense that somebody making \$25,000 or \$30,000, or whatever the cut-off is, pays half as much as somebody who earns \$1 million a year. They don't think that's fair, and they're absolutely right.

They talked about a Robin Hood tax, where people who go to the stock market and gamble on the stock market might have to pay a small percentage for the privilege of doing so, which would raise billions of dollars in and of itself.

They said that maybe some people might even be interested in paying a voluntary tax. I kind of scoffed at the idea until I opened up, again, the newspaper today here in Toronto to read that last year the city of Toronto asked for people to voluntarily give extra taxes, and they made \$1.2 million last year, and this year they expect to double or triple it, because people in this city understand you cannot cut out those taxes and still have the kind of services that we have come to demand.

So here we have it. We already have the lowest taxes in North America. We are lower than Mexico. We are lower than Guatemala. I take no umbrage against those countries, but I am saying, how low can we possibly go and still have the kinds of services that people expect?

In the past number of years, under this government, we have transferred some \$10 billion to the corporate sector from our own treasury. That's \$10 billion we don't have to spend. What has happened with this money? We now have a province where the corporations are sitting on \$477 billion in cash reserves. That is up 750% since 1995. In 16 years, they have increased their cash reserves to \$477 billion that are sitting there. What is happening with this money? I ask the members opposite, I ask my Conservative colleagues who put this forward, what is happening with it? Are they creating jobs with it? No. We know that the unemployment rate in some areas has actually gone up.

If you travel, as I did over these past few weeks, to places like Windsor and Sarnia, where the unemployment rate is at 11% and 12%—all of that cash reserve is going to nothing. It's going to line pockets. It's going offshore. If you go to London, you'll see that all of that cash reserve is going to Caterpillar, who picks up the plant and moves to Indiana. No jobs are being created, and no jobs will be created if we follow this motion. Nothing is going to happen except that people are going to get more wealthy than they already are, and that money is going to be moved into jurisdictions where the government cannot touch it.

You know, I think the time has come for ordinary people to speak out, as they did to me on the committee, for ordinary people to say that the rich and those who are well off and those who can need to pay some of their fair share. I know that when President Obama stood there at the State of the Union, he said nothing different from what I am saying here today. You have to question why the secretary of Warren Buffett pays the same tax rate as Warren Buffett himself. You have to ask why billionaires like Warren Buffett can say, "We ought to pay more. This is not fair, what's happening." You have to ask questions.

Even Rick Santorum, running for the Republican leadership, for the nomination, is saying that no more can we give corporations money without ironclad guarantees of jobs. Everybody is starting to talk that way. It's time this government did, and I cannot support a party that is putting forward a motion that's going to do diametrically the opposite.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Toby Barrett:** You know, reducing the business tax rate to 10% is the same tax cut the Ontario Chamber of Commerce supported in 2009 during their pre-budget submission, to provide competitive business tax rates to kick-start the private sector economy. I quote: "A reduction in corporate tax rates [is] the most helpful initiative for helping businesses in the short term and improving long-term competitiveness."

And this from the Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters: Corporate tax reductions demonstrate "a strong correlation between reduced taxes, increased investment in machinery and equipment and, ultimately, job growth, an increased standard of living and increased quality of life." They go on to say that "lower corporate tax rates encourage businesses to spend more on research and development," and that they accelerate economic growth by creating jobs and boosting investment.

To put it all together, Speaker, "Higher levels of employment, business investment, and R&D spending lead to stronger GDP performance. All are positively related to increases in after-tax business profits"—again like the tax cuts.

Thank you, Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate? I recognize the member from Durham.

**Mr. John O'Toole:** Thank you very much, Speaker.

This particular motion is another clear example of this government being untrustworthy. You know, to put this in context, our leader, Tim Hudak, is trying to make it clear about the jobs and the economy in Ontario. That is the biggest—we could talk about lots of other things, but really it's about jobs and the economy.

Now, what you need in investment to create the jobs isn't more public sector; what you need is the private sector to create wealth. The 600,000 people that are out there in those families without income are dependent on government, which increases your risks and your costs. What you need is a plan here for jobs and the economy,

and what this motion does is clarify for the investors around the world who may be looking at Ontario, perhaps even Samsung, to know the certainty of the tax regime within the province of Ontario.

1730

Now, if you look further back at the earlier budget, where this long-term implementation plan on corporate tax relief was introduced, there were phases when parts of it were to be introduced. Most businesses and investors would be looking at that timetable: When is a good time to invest, given the encumbrance of tax on their hopeful profits?

This is another example of Ontario backing away from their commitments. I'd call it blatant lying, but that's out of order and I understand that. Really, what it is is another broken promise. You know, if you pay attention to Premier McGuinty, he has no plan for the economy of Ontario. He has sold out every opportunity for our children.

I look at the pages here, with another week to go in the Legislature. We're all talking about your future, because this government is going to double the deficit to \$30 billion—Don Drummond said that—and the debt to \$400 million. What does this mean to the 600,000 people? A very bleak future.

I'm going relinquish the floor, because I am so upset by this: another continuous kind of litany of broken promises, relentlessly on the people of Ontario, and no plan for the future except more taxes. So, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I support this. I urge the members of the government side to think clearly about the future of the children and the young people with no jobs. Think of the children. Thank you.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. John Yakubuski:** Speaker—

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** I've stood up already.

**Mr. John Yakubuski:** Oh, come on, Speaker. Point of order—

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Well, you know, I can't sit here and—

**Mr. John Yakubuski:** Point of order: This is a game being played here. We know exactly what's going on. When you looked down, Mr. McNaughton was standing up.

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Order. Just for all the members in the House, I did call for further debate three times. Nobody stood up.

**Mr. John Yakubuski:** Twice. Twice.

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Three times.

**Mr. John Yakubuski:** We'll check Hansard.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Check it.

**Mr. Mario Sergio:** Are you challenging the Chair?

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Yes, I am. It was twice.

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** I would say to all members in the House, I did call for debate three times. Based on the arguments on both sides, I will do it one more time, and I will not entertain the games that are going on any more.

Further debate?

**Mr. Monte McNaughton:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Just hang on until I recognize you.

The member from Lambton—Kent—Middlesex.

**Mr. Monte McNaughton:** Thank you very much again, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me today and having the opportunity to speak to this Ontario PC motion for job creation in this tax relief measure.

You see, Speaker, as you know, I come from a family business, a business background in downtown Newbury. We've been in business for over 63 years. I'm a small-town Home Hardware Building Centre dealer, auto and farm supply store, and Rogers and LCBO agency store, all under one roof. I know about business and private sector jobs, because that's where I come from, and I know businesses need dependability and consistency for planning purposes.

This motion will reaffirm the Legislature's support for the planned and currently legislated corporate tax reductions that are scheduled to take effect on July 1 of this year, and that is something that I and my colleagues on this side of the House strongly support. You see, it is my goal, and indeed the goal of the Ontario PC Party and our leader, Tim Hudak, to make Ontario the best place to invest, the best place to do business and the best place to create jobs in the country.

You see, Speaker, businesses across the province—small and medium-sized businesses and corporations—are counting on these tax deductions. They've already been passed into law, and responsible corporations are now planning and counting on these reductions to continue to get the Ontario economy back on its feet and help the 600,000 men and women across the province who are out of work.

We believe in being fair, open and transparent on this side of the House. That's how I was raised, and that's how we do business. Government should do the same. I know that these across-the-board, broad-based corporate tax cuts are much better than picking and choosing certain items and applying tax credits here and there.

These broad-based corporate tax cuts are much better than the current corporate welfare system being used by the governing Liberals. In fact, in 2009 and 2010 this Dalton McGuinty government gave away \$3 billion in corporate welfare. If we want to make Ontario a leader again, we need to make it the best place in Canada to find permanent private sector jobs. Tim Hudak and the Ontario PC caucus believe in strengthening Ontario's

economy by making it attractive for investment and private sector job creation.

The Ontario PC Party has always been committed to ensuring that businesses are able to compete and are able to help grow our economy. We need to create more jobs and create the conditions in which businesses in Ontario can survive and prosper.

To conclude, I want to raise the key message in this debate today. If we want to make Ontario a leader in Canada once again, we need to make it the best place in Canada to find good, permanent private sector jobs, something this government clearly does not understand.

Tim Hudak and the Ontario PC caucus believe in strengthening Ontario's economy by making it attractive for investment and private sector job creation. I would encourage all members of the House to support our leader and our party in this motion today. Thank you.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** Thank you very much, Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to—

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Point of order.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Point of order, the member from Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** This is a mockery, Speaker. They didn't want a debate and now they want to debate? They've got to get with the program and grow up. They've made a mockery of debate in this House. We're debating a serious issue. They had no interest in standing in debate, trying to play some kind of childish game, and now they're interested in getting into debate. Shame on them.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** That's not a point of order.

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Order in the House. Please sit down. I would let the member know that that's not a point of order.

The member from Ottawa Centre.

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** Thank you, Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to speak on this motion and participate in this important debate.

It's interesting that in Ontario we've gone through really tough economic times. And not only in Ontario; globally, we've gone through tough economic times. The recession in 2009 was a significant one. It was a global recession that impacted economies around the globe, not only just Canada and Ontario.

But when the recession hit Ontario, this McGuinty government took immediate action. We, as a government, did not shy away from ensuring that we were there to assist the growth of the Ontario economy, that we were there to ensure that there are opportunities, that Ontario is a competitive place to do business. Therefore, we brought in a very comprehensive strategy to create a plan, to create jobs and to grow the economy. We brought in a strategy, backed up by legislation, that looked at our whole tax infrastructure. We looked at our sales taxes, we looked at our personal income taxes, and we looked at our corporate taxes.

1740

Speaker, on the side of sales taxes, we took a very important—difficult but important—step of harmonizing GST and PST, making sure that our businesses have the advantage, as they have in other jurisdictions, in 140 jurisdictions around the world, in terms of having a value-added tax. That saved businesses more than \$500 million alone per year in paperwork. And that's just administrative savings, not to mention ensuring that businesses are able, especially small businesses, to take advantage of a value-added tax, which ensures that they can bring the cost of production down and be more competitive in the marketplace—the same principle as the GST when it was brought in at the federal level and other, Maritime, provinces that have also introduced harmonized sales taxes.

That was a very important step and a difficult one. It was something that was supported by all businesses, especially our small businesses in this province, making them more competitive, and a great boon for our manufacturing sector.

Speaker, where was the opposition? First, they were for it. They thought it was a good idea, and they then turned against it. They did everything in their power to ensure that the HST does not come into place in Ontario, that our businesses, especially small businesses, do not get the support they so very much deserve.

Now they're standing up and talking about creating opportunity for businesses. When they had the opportunity in 2009, they voted against it, every single one of them.

The same thing when we brought in significant relief in terms of personal taxes, where we reduced personal taxes to offset the impact of the HST on consumers: We brought in tax relief through cuts and credits for Ontarians worth \$12 billion over three years. Nine out of 10 taxpayers are paying less income tax in the province of Ontario, saving an average—an income tax cut of about \$355 this year alone. How did the opposition, Speaker—you will think that they supported that. No, they did not. They voted against that tax cut for hard-working Ontarians as well.

Now let's talk about corporate taxes, the subject of this particular motion. Through the same plan that we brought in—the plan for jobs and growth for Ontario—we not only brought in the harmonization of GST and PST to help our small businesses, we not only cut personal income taxes to help Ontarians, especially those low- to mid-income; we also reduced corporate income taxes. We brought in legislation that cut the small business corporate tax rate by 18%—a small business tax reduction by 18%—and eliminated the small business surtax. We are the only jurisdiction in Canada to eliminate this barrier to growth for our businesses.

We also reduced the manufacturing and processing corporate income tax rate to 10%. This includes forestry, farming, fishing and mining—a 17% cut, and also, at the end of the day, we eliminated the capital tax on all businesses.

Listening to the debate taking place today, you would farming, fishing and mining—a 17% cut. Also, at the end of the day, we eliminated the capital tax on all businesses.

Listening to the debate taking place today, you would think the opposition must have supported that particular measure. No, Speaker, they did not. They voted against the corporate tax cut. In fact, the vote took place in this House on May 27, 2009. May 27, 2009, the opposition, who brought this motion, voted against a significant cut in the corporate income tax rate for small businesses, eliminating the small business surtax, bringing the corporate tax rate on manufacturing and processing down to 10%.

And now they are talking about businesses. Where were they when businesses needed their help in 2009, to help grow our economy? Where was their defence for our small businesses, the engine of economic growth and jobs, back in 2009? That time, I think they chose to play politics. But thanks to the measures that we have brought in, we are seeing new jobs being created in our province every single day. We're seeing a net job gain in 2011 alone of 121,300 jobs that have been created since 2003.

Now, I understand that this is an opposition day motion. There's always some political game and mischief that goes along with it. What the opposition is trying to do is try to have a conversation on a budgetary measure through this motion. Here's a reason we will be voting against this motion: because it is an inappropriate subject to discuss during budget preparation.

Speaker, you know that developing a budget is a robust process. There are many different aspects to a budget, and you do not develop measures in a budget through an opposition day motion. You cannot just look at one element of the budget in isolation, as this motion is purporting to do; you have to examine it in an overall context. That's why it's really important that we do not vote in support of this motion, because it really takes away from the important work that is going on, both in terms of the consultation with Ontarians, far and wide—and we are all engaged in that process. We are talking to Ontarians, and we're listening to them as to what should be the priority; how we bring fiscal sustainability, moving forward, in these tough economic times; how we make sure that we are able to eliminate our deficit by 2017-18, as is the commitment by this government, and ensure that we've got job creation and economic growth. The government will listen to Ontarians across this great province, we will listen to their point of view. We'll take a balanced approach based on that and put forward a budget later in time.

We don't get to decide important aspects of the budget through debating motions like this one that has been put forward. So my urging to all members of this Legislature is to vote against this motion, because not only is it inappropriate to be brought in front of us here, but I also think it shows exactly the kind of political games—mischief, perhaps—the opposition is trying to play.

When there was the time to support a competitive corporate tax structure for the hard-working small busi-

nesses across this province, the opposition who sponsored this motion voted against that. When it came time to help hard-working Ontarians by lowering their personal income taxes, this opposition voted against that. When it came time to harmonize the GST and PST to create a modern sales tax system in the province of Ontario that gives our small businesses a competitive advantage, this opposition voted against it. Now they're coming and talking about the job creators of this province.

This government has always been on the side of small businesses, this government has always been on the side of businesses, and we'll continue to do so, Speaker, so that we're creating good jobs. We'll continue to invest in health care and education so that we'll have a highly skilled job force.

I urge all the members of this Legislature to vote against this motion so that we can continue with the budget process and bring a budget that will bring fiscal sustainability, grow our economy and create new jobs.

#### *Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Order. Please sit down.

Mr. Hudak has moved opposition day motion number

1. Shall the motion carry? I heard a no.

All those in favour of the motion, please say "aye."

All those opposed to the motion, please say "nay."

I think the ayes have it.

Call in the members. This will be a 10-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1750 to 1800.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Would members take their seats, please.

Mr. Hudak has moved opposition day motion number

1. All those in favour, please stand one at a time.

Arnott, Ted  
Bailey, Robert  
Barrett, Toby  
Chudleigh, Ted

**Ayes**  
Jones, Sylvia  
Klees, Frank  
Leone, Rob  
MacLaren, Jack

O'Toole, John  
Ouellette, Jerry J.  
Pettapiece, Randy  
Scott, Laurie

Clark, Steve  
Dunlop, Garfield  
Elliott, Christine  
Fedeli, Victor  
Hardeman, Ernie  
Harris, Michael  
Hudak, Tim  
Jackson, Rod

MacLeod, Lisa  
McDonell, Jim  
McKenna, Jane  
McNaughton, Monte  
Miller, Norm  
Milligan, Rob E.  
Munro, Julia  
Nicholls, Rick

Shurman, Peter  
Smith, Todd  
Thompson, Lisa M.  
Walker, Bill  
Wilson, Jim  
Witmer, Elizabeth  
Yakabuski, John  
Yurek, Jeff

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** All those opposed, please rise one at a time.

#### **Nays**

Albanese, Laura  
Armstrong, Teresa J.  
Balkissoon, Bas  
Bartolucci, Rick  
Bentley, Christopher  
Berardinetti, Lorenzo  
Best, Margaret  
Bisson, Gilles  
Bradley, James J.  
Broten, Laurel C.  
Campbell, Sarah  
Cansfield, Donna H.  
Chan, Michael  
Chiarelli, Bob  
Colle, Mike  
Coteau, Michael  
Crack, Grant  
Craitor, Kim  
Dameria, Dipika  
Delaney, Bob  
Dhillon, Vic  
Dickson, Joe

DiNovo, Cheri  
Duguid, Brad  
Flynn, Kevin Daniel  
Forster, Cindy  
Gerretsen, John  
Gélinas, France  
Gravelle, Michael  
Horwath, Andrea  
Hoskins, Eric  
Jaczek, Helena  
Jeffrey, Linda  
Kwintar, Monte  
Leal, Jeff  
MacCharles, Tracy  
Mangat, Amrit  
Mantha, Michael  
Marchese, Rosario  
Matthews, Deborah  
McQuinty, Dalton  
McMeekin, Ted  
McNeely, Phil  
Meilleur, Madeleine

Moridi, Reza  
Murray, Glen R.  
Naqvi, Yasir  
Natyshak, Taras  
Oraziotti, David  
Piruzza, Teresa  
Prue, Michael  
Qaadri, Shafiq  
Sandals, Liz  
Schein, Jonah  
Sergio, Mario  
Singh, Jagmeet  
Sousa, Charles  
Tabuns, Peter  
Takhar, Harinder S.  
Taylor, Monique  
Vanthof, John  
Wong, Soo  
Wynne, Kathleen O.  
Zimmer, David

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):** The ayes are 36; the nays are 64.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I declare the motion defeated.

*Motion negated.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** If there's no further business of the House, this House stands adjourned until 9 p.m. tomorrow—a.m., not p.m. Somebody told me they wanted to work late.

*The House adjourned at 1804.*

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO**  
**ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: Hon. / L'hon. David C. Onley, O.Ont.

Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Dave Levac

Clerk / Greffière: Deborah Deller

Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman, Tonia Grannum

Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Albanese, Laura (LIB)	York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston	
Armstrong, Teresa J. (NDP)	London–Fanshawe	
Arnott, Ted (PC)	Wellington–Halton Hills	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée
Bailey, Robert (PC)	Sarnia–Lambton	
Balkissoon, Bas (LIB)	Scarborough–Rouge River	Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée Deputy Speaker / Vice-président
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand–Norfolk	
Bartolucci, Hon. / L'hon. Rick (LIB)	Sudbury	Chair of Cabinet / Président du Conseil des ministres Minister of Northern Development and Mines / Ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie
Bentley, Hon. / L'hon. Christopher (LIB)	London West / London-Ouest	
Berardinetti, Lorenzo (LIB)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	
Best, Hon. / L'hon. Margaret R. (LIB)	Scarborough–Guildwood	Minister of Consumer Services / Ministre des Services aux consommateurs
Bisson, Gilles (NDP)	Timmins–James Bay / Timmins–Baie James	House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire de parti reconnu
Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (LIB)	St. Catharines	Minister of the Environment / Ministre de l'Environnement Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
Broten, Hon. / L'hon. Laurel C. (LIB)	Etobicoke–Lakeshore	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation Minister Responsible for Women's Issues / Ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Campbell, Sarah (NDP)	Kenora–Rainy River	
Cansfield, Donna H. (LIB)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	
Chan, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)	Markham–Unionville	Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport / Ministre de Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport
Chiarelli, Hon. / L'hon. Bob (LIB)	Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Minister of Infrastructure / Ministre de l'Infrastructure Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Halton	
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds–Grenville	
Colle, Mike (LIB)	Eglinton–Lawrence	
Coteau, Michael (LIB)	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	
Crack, Grant (LIB)	Glengarry–Prescott–Russell	
Craitor, Kim (LIB)	Niagara Falls	
Damerla, Dipika (LIB)	Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville	
Delaney, Bob (LIB)	Mississauga–Streetsville	
Dhillon, Vic (LIB)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Dickson, Joe (LIB)	Ajax–Pickering	
DiNovo, Cheri (NDP)	Parkdale–High Park	
Duguid, Hon. / L'hon. Brad (LIB)	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Minister of Economic Development and Innovation / Ministre du Développement économique et de l'Innovation Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / Président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement Deputy Premier / Vice-premier ministre Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances
Duncan, Hon. / L'hon. Dwight (LIB)	Windsor–Tecumseh	
Dunlop, Garfield (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	
Elliott, Christine (PC)	Whitby–Oshawa	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Fedeli, Victor (PC)	Nipissing	
Flynn, Kevin Daniel (LIB)	Oakville	
Forster, Cindy (NDP)	Welland	Deputy House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire adjointe de parti reconnu
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	
<b>Gerretsen, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles	Attorney General / Procureur général
<b>Gravelle, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Thunder Bay–Superior North / Thunder Bay–Superior-Nord	Minister of Natural Resources / Ministre des Richesses naturelles
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	
Harris, Michael (PC)	Kitchener–Conestoga	
Hillier, Randy (PC)	Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington	
Horwath, Andrea (NDP)	Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre	Leader, Recognized Party / Chef de parti reconnu Leader, New Democratic Party of Ontario / Chef du Nouveau parti démocratique de l'Ontario
<b>Hoskins, Hon. / L'hon. Eric (LIB)</b>	St. Paul's	Minister of Children and Youth Services / Ministre des Services à l'enfance et à la jeunesse
Hudak, Tim (PC)	Niagara West–Glanbrook / Niagara-Ouest–Glanbrook	Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle Leader, Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur de l'Ontario
Jackson, Rod (PC)	Barrie	
Jaczek, Helena (LIB)	Oak Ridges–Markham	
<b>Jeffrey, Hon. / L'hon. Linda (LIB)</b>	Brampton–Springdale	Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail Minister Responsible for Seniors / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires des personnes âgées
Jones, Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin–Caledon	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Klees, Frank (PC)	Newmarket–Aurora	
Kwinter, Monte (LIB)	York Centre / York-Centre	
Leal, Jeff (LIB)	Peterborough	
Leone, Rob (PC)	Cambridge	
<b>Levac, Hon. / L'hon. Dave (LIB)</b>	Brant	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
MacCharles, Tracy (LIB)	Pickering–Scarborough East / Pickering–Scarborough-Est	
MacLaren, Jack (PC)	Carleton–Mississippi Mills	
MacLeod, Lisa (PC)	Nepean–Carleton	
Mangat, Amrit (LIB)	Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud	
Mantha, Michael (NDP)	Algoma–Manitoulin	
Marchese, Rosario (NDP)	Trinity–Spadina	
<b>Matthews, Hon. / L'hon. Deborah (LIB)</b>	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / Ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Mauro, Bill (LIB)	Thunder Bay–Atikokan	
McDonell, Jim (PC)	Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry	
<b>McGuinity, Hon. / L'hon. Dalton (LIB)</b>	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales Premier / Premier ministre Leader, Government / Chef du gouvernement Leader, Liberal Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti libéral de l'Ontario
McKenna, Jane (PC)	Burlington	
<b>McMeekin, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (LIB)</b>	Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough–Westdale	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
McNaughton, Monte (PC)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	
McNeely, Phil (LIB)	Ottawa–Orléans	
<b>Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (LIB)</b>	Ottawa–Vanier	Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / Ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones
Miller, Norm (PC)	Parry Sound–Muskoka	
<b>Miller, Paul (NDP)</b>	Hamilton East–Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est–Stoney Creek	Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Milligan, Rob E. (PC)	Northumberland—Quinte West	Minister of Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement
<b>Millroy, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	
Moridi, Reza (LIB)	Richmond Hill	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Munro, Julia (PC)</b>	York—Simcoe	
<b>Murray, Hon. / L'hon. Glen R. (LIB)</b>	Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Naqvi, Yasir (LIB)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration / Ministre des Affaires civiques et de l'Immigration
Natyshak, Taras (NDP)	Essex	
Nicholls, Rick (PC)	Chatham—Kent—Essex	
O'Toole, John (PC)	Durham	
Oraziotti, David (LIB)	Sault Ste. Marie	
Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Oshawa	
Pettapiece, Randy (PC)	Perth—Wellington	
Piruzza, Teresa (LIB)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	
Prue, Michael (NDP)	Beaches—East York	
Qaadri, Shafiq (LIB)	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	
Sandals, Liz (LIB)	Guelph	
Schein, Jonah (NDP)	Davenport	
Scott, Laurie (PC)	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	
Sergio, Mario (LIB)	York West / York-Ouest	
Shurman, Peter (PC)	Thornhill	
Singh, Jagmeet (NDP)	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	
Smith, Todd (PC)	Prince Edward—Hastings	
Sorbara, Greg (LIB)	Vaughan	
<b>Sousa, Hon. / L'hon. Charles (LIB)</b>	Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud	
Tabuns, Peter (NDP)	Toronto—Danforth	Minister of Government Services / Ministre des Services gouvernementaux
<b>Takhar, Hon. / L'hon. Harinder S. (LIB)</b>	Mississauga—Erindale	
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle
Thompson, Lisa M. (PC)	Huron—Bruce	
Vanthof, John (NDP)	Timiskaming—Cochrane	
Walker, Bill (PC)	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	
Wilson, Jim (PC)	Simcoe—Grey	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Witmer, Elizabeth (PC)	Kitchener—Waterloo	
Wong, Soo (LIB)	Scarborough—Agincourt	
<b>Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (LIB)</b>	Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	
Yakabuski, John (PC)	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	
Yurek, Jeff (PC)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	
Zimmer, David (LIB)	Willowdale	

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉES PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Standing Committee on Estimates / Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses**

Chair / Président: Michael Prue  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Taras Natyshak  
Grant Crack, Kim Craiton  
Vic Dhillon, Michael Harris  
Rob Leone, Taras Natyshak  
Rick Nicholls, Michael Prue  
Mario Sergio  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs /  
Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Bob Delaney, Victor Fedeli  
Cindy Forster, Monte McNaughton  
Yasir Naqvi, Teresa Piruzza  
Michael Prue, Peter Shurman  
Soo Wong  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on General Government / Comité  
permanent des affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: David Oraziotti  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: David Zimmer  
Sarah Campbell, Michael Coteau  
Joe Dickson, Rosario Marchese  
David Oraziotti, Laurie Scott  
Todd Smith, Jeff Yurek  
David Zimmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przewdziecki

**Standing Committee on Government Agencies / Comité  
permanent des organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Donna H. Cansfield, Helena Jaczek  
Bill Mauro, Jim McDonell  
Phil McNeely, Randy Pettapiece  
Peter Tabuns, Monique Taylor  
Lisa M. Thompson  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Justice Policy / Comité permanent de  
la justice**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Laura Albanese, Teresa J. Armstrong  
Lorenzo Berardinetti, Mike Colle  
Frank Klees, Jack MacLaren  
Paul Miller, Rob E. Milligan  
Shafiq Qaadi  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly / Comité  
permanent de l'Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: Garfield Dunlop  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Lisa MacLeod  
Laura Albanese, Bas Balkissoon  
Gilles Bisson, Donna H. Cansfield  
Steve Clark, Garfield Dunlop  
Jeff Leal, Lisa MacLeod  
Jonah Schein  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts / Comité permanent  
des comptes publics**

Chair / Président: Norm Miller  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Toby Barrett  
Toby Barrett, France Gélinas  
Phil McNeely, Norm Miller  
Reza Moridi, Jerry J. Ouellette  
Liz Sandals, Jagmeet Singh  
David Zimmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills / Comité  
permanent des règlements et des projets de loi d'intérêt privé**

Chair / Président: Peter Tabuns  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: John Vanthof  
Michael Coteau, Grant Crack  
Vic Dhillon, Randy Hillier  
Rod Jackson, Mario Sergio  
Peter Tabuns, John Vanthof  
Bill Walker  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Tamara Pomanski

**Standing Committee on Social Policy / Comité permanent de  
la politique sociale**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Ted Chudleigh, Dipika Damerla  
Cheri DiNovo, Kevin Daniel Flynn  
Ernie Hardeman, Tracy MacCharles  
Amrit Mangat, Michael Mantha  
Jane McKenna  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch





# CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Wednesday 29 February 2012 / Mercredi 29 février 2012

## ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

### Security for Courts, Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012, Bill 34, Mrs. Meilleur / Loi de 2012 sur la sécurité des tribunaux, des centrales électriques et des installations nucléaires, projet de loi 34, Mme Meilleur

Mr. John Yakabuski .....	731
Mr. Michael Prue .....	738
Hon. John Gerretsen .....	739
Mr. Rob Leone .....	739
Mr. Taras Natyshak .....	739
Mr. John Yakabuski .....	739
Second reading debate deemed adjourned .....	740

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Ms. Lisa MacLeod .....	740
Hon. Laurel C. Broten .....	740
Mr. Frank Klees .....	740
Mr. Michael Coteau .....	740
Ms. Sylvia Jones .....	740
Mr. John O'Toole .....	740
Mr. Jim McDonnell .....	740
Mr. Bob Delaney .....	740
Mr. Frank Klees .....	740
Mrs. Laura Albanese .....	740
Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer .....	740
Mr. Monte McNaughton .....	740

## ORAL QUESTIONS / QUESTIONS ORALES

### Taxation

Mr. Peter Shurman .....	740
Hon. Dwight Duncan .....	741

### Taxation

Mr. Peter Shurman .....	741
Hon. Dwight Duncan .....	741

### Taxation

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	742
Hon. Dalton McGuinty .....	742

### Air ambulance service

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	743
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	743

### Air ambulance service

Mr. Frank Klees .....	744
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	744

### Taxation

Mr. Michael Prue .....	744
Hon. Dwight Duncan .....	744

### Anti-bullying initiatives

Mr. Yasir Naqvi .....	745
Hon. Laurel C. Broten .....	745

### Air ambulance service

Mr. Victor Fedeli .....	745
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	745

### Child care

Mr. Peter Tabuns .....	746
Hon. Laurel C. Broten .....	746

### Health care

Mr. Bob Delaney .....	746
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	746

### Air ambulance service

Mr. John O'Toole .....	747
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	747

### Workplace safety

Mr. Michael Mantha .....	747
Hon. Rick Bartolucci .....	747
Mme France Gélinas .....	748
Hon. Linda Jeffrey .....	748

### Justice system

Mr. Bas Balkissoon .....	748
Hon. John Gerretsen .....	748

### Long-term care

Mr. John Yakabuski .....	749
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	749

### Occupational health and safety

Mr. Taras Natyshak .....	749
Hon. Linda Jeffrey .....	749

### Air quality

Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti .....	750
Hon. James J. Bradley .....	750

### Correction of record

Mr. John O'Toole .....	750
------------------------	-----

Continued on inside back cover

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Ms. Lisa MacLeod .....	750
Mr. John O'Toole.....	750
Ms. Soo Wong.....	751
The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac).....	751

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS / DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

<b>Green power generation</b>	
Mr. Monte McNaughton .....	751
<b>New Choices program</b>	
Miss Monique Taylor.....	751
<b>Agincourt Collegiate Institute</b>	
Ms. Soo Wong.....	751
<b>Automotive industry</b>	
Mr. Rod Jackson .....	752
<b>Temiskaming Nordic Ski Club</b>	
Mr. John Vanthof.....	752
<b>AUTO21</b>	
Mrs. Teresa Piruzza.....	752
<b>International Rare Disease Day</b>	
Mrs. Christine Elliott.....	752
<b>National Brain Awareness Month</b>	
Mr. Yasir Naqvi .....	753
<b>Barrhaven Food Cupboard</b>	
Ms. Lisa MacLeod .....	753

## STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES / DÉCLARATIONS MINISTÉRIELLES ET RÉPONSES

<b>Anti-bullying initiatives</b>	
Hon. Eric Hoskins .....	753
Ms. Lisa MacLeod .....	754
Miss Monique Taylor.....	755

## PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS

<b>Rural schools</b>	
Mr. John O'Toole.....	756

<b>Diagnostic services</b>	
Mme France Gélinas .....	756
<b>Education funding</b>	
Mr. Phil McNeely.....	756
<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. Todd Smith.....	756
<b>Dog ownership</b>	
Ms. Cheri DiNovo .....	757
<b>Environmental protection</b>	
Mr. John O'Toole.....	757
<b>Kidney disease</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal.....	757
<b>Long-term care</b>	
Mr. Ernie Hardeman.....	757
<b>School accommodation</b>	
Mr. Toby Barrett .....	758
<b>Skilled trades</b>	
Mr. Jim McDonell.....	758
<b>Kidney disease</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal.....	758
<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. Rob E. Milligan .....	758
<b>Dog ownership</b>	
Ms. Cheri DiNovo .....	759

## OPPOSITION DAY / JOUR DE L'OPPOSITION

<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. Tim Hudak.....	759
Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	761
Mr. Bob Delaney .....	762
Mr. Peter Shurman .....	764
Mr. Rosario Marchese .....	764
Mr. Jeff Leal.....	766
Mrs. Christine Elliott.....	767
Mr. Jagmeet Singh .....	768
Hon. Glen R. Murray.....	769
Mr. Michael Harris .....	770
Mr. Michael Prue .....	771
Mr. Toby Barrett .....	773
Mr. John O'Toole.....	773
Mr. Monte McNaughton .....	774
Mr. Yasir Naqvi .....	774
Motion negated .....	776

11-20-2012  
X1  
-D23



No. 19

N° 19

ISSN 1180-2987

## Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 40<sup>th</sup> Parliament

## Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 40<sup>e</sup> législature

# Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

# Journal des débats (Hansard)

Thursday 1 March 2012

Jeudi 1<sup>er</sup> mars 2012



Speaker  
Honourable Dave Levac

Président  
L'honorable Dave Levac

Clerk  
Deborah Deller

Greffière  
Deborah Deller

### **Hansard on the Internet**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

### **Le Journal des débats sur Internet**

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

### **Renseignements sur l'index**

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.

---

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services  
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building  
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park  
Toronto ON M7A 1A2  
Telephone 416-325-7400; fax 416-325-7430  
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service du Journal des débats et d'interprétation  
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement  
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park  
Toronto ON M7A 1A2  
Téléphone, 416-325-7400; télécopieur, 416-325-7430  
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 1 March 2012

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Jeudi 1<sup>er</sup> mars 2012

*The House met at 0900.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Please join me in prayer.

*Prayers.*

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### SECURITY FOR COURTS, ELECTRICITY GENERATING FACILITIES AND NUCLEAR FACILITIES ACT, 2012 LOI DE 2012 SUR LA SÉCURITÉ DES TRIBUNAUX, DES CENTRALES ÉLECTRIQUES ET DES INSTALLATIONS NUCLÉAIRES

Resuming the debate adjourned on February 29, 2012, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 34, An Act to repeal the Public Works Protection Act, amend the Police Services Act with respect to court security and enact the Security for Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012 / *Projet de loi 34, Loi abrogeant la Loi sur la protection des ouvrages publics, modifiant la Loi sur les services policiers en ce qui concerne la sécurité des tribunaux et édictant la Loi de 2012 sur la sécurité des centrales électriques et des installations nucléaires.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further debate? The member for Essex.

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With your indulgence, I'll be splitting my time with the member for Bramalea-Gore-Malton.

I'm happy to debate the repeal of the Public Works Protection Act and the proposed amendments to the Police Services Act in relation to court security and new security for electricity generating facilities and nuclear facilities. I think it's important to touch on some of the issues that came about during the application of the PWPA which are leading to its repeal. It's also important to discuss what happened in 2010, because these amendments are meant to ensure that it never happens again and that government has learned its lesson.

This bill is a direct result of the issues that many citizens' groups have raised and of the response of the government of Ontario during the G20 events in 2010. More than 1,100 arrests were made, the largest mass arrest in Canadian history. There was widespread denial of democratic rights and freedoms, and a secret law was enacted. There were less-than-transparent decision-making pro-

cesses between government and law enforcement. As a result, six separate reviews took place around G20 security. Yet none had the mandate or the jurisdiction to ask the most fundamental questions or provide Ontarians with answers they were seeking.

Andrea Horwath introduced a private member's bill, the G20 Public Inquiry Act. This bill would have established an independent commission that would have carried out a full public inquiry. Despite all the reviews that took place, a public inquiry is the missing and essential piece of the G20 puzzle. The public inquiry would have reported on the decisions and actions of the McGuinty government and law enforcement during the G20. It would have provided a fuller accounting of taxpayer dollars. However, this bill did not pass and Ontarians never got the answers that were owed to them from this failed security policy during the G20.

It comes as no surprise to any of us when I say there were serious issues with security during the G20. Civil liberties were trampled, and we all saw it on TV while it happened. The Canadian Civil Liberties Association had this to say about government actions during the G20:

"The conditions for some of the policing problems that were experienced during the summit were set during the preparatory stage ... For example, the lack of transparency surrounding the designation of the security perimeter as a 'public work' led to misunderstandings as to the scope of search and seizure powers and, in our view, to an inappropriate use of the these powers. The large number of police officers during the week leading to the G20 generated both a suspicion of wasted resources and a sentiment of potential intimidation. June 26 represents a turning point. Widespread property damage was committed by a cohort of vandals in the downtown of Toronto on that day. We condemn this criminal activity and acknowledge that it warranted a response by police. The response which police provided, however, was unprecedented, disproportionate and, at times, unconstitutional."

From the many reports, it emerged that government had enacted regulations that increased the powers of police—except that nobody knew about them until people started getting arrested. CCLA asked for an apology from the government of Ontario on the way it handled G20 security, but that was never received.

As reports surfaced with their recommendations, it became clear that there was considerable reason for concern in the way that the government had handled the period before the G20 and the events itself. Stories circulated through the G20 weekend of citizens being stopped and searched at various locations in the downtown core only

because they were wearing an item of black clothing. A number of people also reported that police cited the Public Works Protection Act as authority to conduct searches and require identification, despite the fact that they were nowhere near the security fence.

Most importantly, regulation 233/10, passed to enhance security during the G20 summit, was viewed by many as an issue in and of itself. Ombudsman André Marin stated, "Regulation 233/10, passed to enhance security during the G20 summit, should never have been enacted. It was likely unconstitutional. The effect of regulation 233/10, now expired, was to infringe on freedom of expression in ways that do not seem justifiable in a free and democratic society. Specifically, the passage of the regulation triggered the extravagant police authority found in the Public Works Protection Act, including the power to arbitrarily arrest and detain people and to engage in unreasonable searches and seizures. Even apart from the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the legality of regulation 233/10 is doubtful. The Public Works Protection Act under which it was proclaimed authorizes regulations to be created to protect infrastructure, not to provide security to people during events. Regulation 233/10 was therefore probably invalid for having exceeded the authority of the enactment under which it was passed. These problems should have been apparent, and given the tremendous power regulation 233/10 conferred on the police, sober and considered reflection should have been given to whether it was appropriate to arm officers with such authority. This was not done." The decision of the Minister and Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services was to sponsor.

Having said that, let us just assume for a second that regulation 233/10 was indeed appropriate for the circumstances involved. Since the regulation significantly changes the rules of the game, it would only be appropriate that the government would have done whatever was in its power to publicize the fact that the rules had changed. Why would it not notify citizens and groups involved in the protest of the extra requirements?

0910

Had they been properly notified, these groups would have known their rights and what was required of them. Their actions would have been different, and many of the police confrontations would not have occurred. The government failed in providing enough information, Mr. Speaker.

Of the notices that were placed in newspapers, none of them mentioned the PWPA. Full notification of citizens and groups involved in protests was not pursued by the ministry. Even worse, the police themselves were not fully briefed of the extended powers they really possessed. Minister Meilleur said it herself last week, that it was a problem of communication. Communication was definitely one of the major things that was severely wrong with the way the government dealt with G20 security, but it certainly was not the only issue.

Dave Vasey, a York University environmental science masters student, had probably never heard of the Public

Works Protection Act before June 24, 2010. How could he, of course? It was a secret act. Curious about the fence, which isn't a normal sight in downtown Toronto, Mr. Vasey stepped too close to it, to see what was on the inside. This was enough to make police officers suspicious and, armed with the rights that nobody knew about, they stopped Mr. Vasey and asked for identification.

Without knowing about the passing of regulation 233/10, Mr. Vasey refused to provide ID. He would have been well within his rights had the circumstances been different, but the situation was now changed and Mr. Vasey found himself under arrest by authority of the Public Works Protection Act. At least one other person was detained and charged under the act in connection with G20 summit security.

Like many of those stopped, Mr. Vasey was involved in peaceful protest, but the arrests were not confined to just protesters; they included people who were just walking by or who had legitimate business close to the security perimeter. The examples are many, like Rob Kittredge, a lawyer who worked just outside of the security perimeter, whose photographs were confiscated and who was banned from coming close to the security zone under this same act.

Nobody knew about the regulation until after Mr. Vasey was arrested, well after the protest had started. A number of complainants approached the Office of the Ombudsman afterwards. Over 1,000 people were arrested. These complaints gave first-hand accounts of the experiences with police officers during the G20 weekend.

A 57-year-old from Thorold, Ontario, who was an amputee, came down to participate in the labour march rally. After taking part in the march, he rested at the designated speech area here at Queen's Park. This was on Sunday, when the protest was winding down. A few minutes later, police arrived to disperse the crowd and yelled at him to move. Needing help to get up, this man was pushed to the floor by police. His prosthetic leg was removed from him, and he was dragged to the police van. I think we've all seen these pictures, Mr. Speaker.

Why would the ministry allow this important regulation to go under the radar and lead to so much chaos and uncertainty?

By Sunday, the ministry had issued a directive to police telling them that they did not actually have the powers they thought they had beyond the security perimeter of the fence. Even when it became evident that the rules had changed, and where it became evident that the officers did not have the rights that they thought they had, their course did not change.

On Sunday afternoon, Toronto police, acting on reports that criminals had infiltrated a group of protesters, surrounded and contained a crowd of up to 250 in a "kettling" manoeuvre at Queen Street and Spadina around 6 p.m. Over the course of the next few hours, protesters, journalists, casual observers and bystanders stood in the driving rain while some people were arrested, and we all watched these scenes on television. It was clear that by Sunday everything had wound down, but

police were still using their excessive rights to target a group of bystanders who had absolutely no involvement in the protest and who had done nothing illegal.

The process used by the Ontario government to pass regulation 233/10 under the Public Works Protection Act included the absence of public debate, the absence of transparency and consultation, a major problem that led to the many violations during the G20.

Citizens were stripped of rights they possessed and police officers believed they had power they actually did not have, and the Ministry of Community Safety was left to try to mitigate the vacuum.

We've all seen what happened then. Now, how is this government proposing to prevent the issues from happening again? The proposed bill before us today contains three schedules that I will discuss in order.

Number one: The bill would repeal the Public Works Protection Act, an act that was enacted in 1939, which gave police wartime powers. It should never have been used to deal with security during the G20 summit in 2010. It was an act that was taken under extreme emergency measures and, quite frankly, belongs in 1939, not in 2010 in downtown Toronto.

Security or peace officers were given the kind of power and authority that would be expected during an emergency circumstance, which certainly stretches to the point of transgression of constitutional rights for citizens. The G20 certainly did not merit such a response.

It's only normal that during an event of such importance as the G20, security concerns might go against civil liberties, but it should be about finding a balance. As the Ombudsman noted, regulation 233/10 worked to trip the powers of the Public Works Protection Act, thereby enabling the arrest and muting of protesters and others who had done nothing wrong. The impact of regulation 233/10 on freedom of expression was therefore almost certainly disproportionate. So we should all strive to ensure that there is no repeat of the trampling of civil rights that happened during the G20.

Security during the G20 could have been handled under different legislation, Mr. Speaker. The PWPA only dealt with structures and not people. Calling on this particular act to address the issues related with the security of foreign heads of state does not make any sense. Just a simple quote from the PWPA is indicative of the scope and the historical reality that government was faced with in 1939. I quote: "We meet today under circumstances of the utmost gravity. The possibility of war, in which we are now engaged, was fully realized and debated by you at the last session, when you passed unanimously a resolution calling, in such event, for the complete mobilization of all our resources." Quite drastic, Mr. Speaker, even to the point of being draconian in some of its implications.

It's that widespread concern of overarching rights, when it comes to policing powers and the trampling of civil liberties, that we did see during the G20—excessive powers that really put a black mark on certainly this province and this country.

I was thinking about this bill this morning and how really shameful it is—and it was, in light of our historical reputation as being peacekeepers, as being promoters of civil liberties and rights and freedoms.

Our charter: We hold it up; we are proud of it. But yet, when circumstances demand, when those who come into this country are given the red carpet rolled out, as we saw during the G20, the rules change and all measures are put forward to protect foreign nationals—multinationals—that come into our province. And at the expense of whom? At the expense of those who engaged in peaceful protest; at the expense of those who fight day in and day out to promote civil liberties in this country, who may not have been involved in the process, who may have been clear across the country but who saw those rights that they fight for each and every day trampled. What a shame it is.

**0920**

We will discuss this bill today. I think it is certainly an attempt on the government's part to make amends, to undo a wrong and to fix this issue. I certainly look forward to seeing it, in a complete way, through the process. But as I indicated in some of my opening statements, the biggest missing part of this debate is an apology, a sincere apology, something that comes from the government side that says, "We were wrong. We should not have done this, and we certainly should not have done it without consultation. We should not have done it under the cloak of secrecy, behind closed doors, and we realize that now."

It seems as though this government relies solely on hindsight. On every measure, whether we're talking about the G20 and the PWPA or Ornge helicopter, hindsight is 20/20 with this government, but their credibility is really zero when it comes to fixing the issue. I cringe at the thought that they would have a majority government. What would happen? Would these issues come to the light of day?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Sweep it under the rug.

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Gone under the rug. So here we are today with a balance and, I think, a clear perspective—a balance that brings about truth, and is fighting for truth, and respect for those citizens that were unjustly attacked or identified or arrested during the G20. We think that this will provide some remedy to that.

Mr. Speaker, security during the G20 could have been handled under different legislation. The PWPA only dealt with structures, not people. Calling on this particular act to address the issues related to security of foreign heads of state does not make any sense. Just a simple quote—I have already given you this quote.

**Interjection:** Do it again.

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** You want it again? It is a quote from 1939, when the original act was enacted. Canadians were under the threat of war. Circumstances being as they were, you can't blame them for wanting to protect their citizens from potentially unknown enemies. But I think to enact it today—I mean, who is the enemy? Right here, the enemy was the Nazis. In 1939, the enemy was

the Nazis and Hitler. Who were the enemies when this was enacted? Who were you afraid of? Were you afraid of peaceful protest? Were you afraid of Ontarians? Were you afraid of a gentleman who was an amputee? Is that who you were afraid of? It's quite pathetic.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** We couldn't find Rick Bartolucci then. It was unbelievable.

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** He may have been an agent provocateur, as they say.

"Legislation calculated to give effect to the determination then expressed will be immediately submitted to you. You will be asked to pass measures designed to increase agricultural and industrial productions, and for the protection of our vital public works"—referencing again the initial enactors, those legislators in 1939, who brought about this measure.

So even though other provinces have legislation that defines public works for other purposes besides security, no other province—no other province—has regulations such as the PWPA. So Ontario has relied on this emergency act that was enacted in 1939 during war.

It's only normal that we would call such an act into question and think twice before using it in the context of 2010. However, that's precisely what the McGuinty government did in 2010. It used this act to deal with the security perimeter around the G20 area in downtown Toronto. It led to violations of civil rights, misunderstandings on the part of police as to the rights that were given by the act and ultimately, Ontario citizens' democratic rights to protest were curtailed.

It begs the question: Was that the intent? Because you did it. It actually worked very well. You curtailed democratic rights, you curtailed peaceful protest, you muted the voice of those who had dissenting opinions and you did it in a way that really is unprecedented.

So we'll see this act, we will agree that it is necessary, but again, I ask those across the way: an apology. We're two years out of this event; there's no statute of limitations on an apology. We'll take one today on behalf of the government of Ontario to the people of Ontario, that their rights were infringed.

This act led to violations of civil rights, and protest is a democratic right. The citizens of Ontario were entitled to protest and should have been free of unreasonable arrest and arbitrary search during the G20 summit. Only members of the Toronto Police Service knew that the rules had changed. The ministry did not inform the public and did not ensure that police officers even knew what powers they were being given. More than 1,100 people were arrested as 20,000 police officers patrolled the streets during the G20 summit in 2010.

The Ontario government, in 2010, was giving police powers that were designated as a war measure. So were they waging war?

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** One billion dollars was spent for that.

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** I mean, that's a good chunk of change. If you were going to war, you would want, as we ask at the federal level; to provide our military men and

women, our officers, with the appropriate resources, and spare no expense to ensure that they have the tools they need to wage war. It seems as though there was no expense spared on this measure: \$2 billion, fake lakes, gazebos, sound cannons—what else did they have? This was an all-in event. Massive fences that were erected. You turned this downtown core area into a war zone.

**Mr. Jonah Schein:** Why did it happen in Toronto?

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Why Toronto? Why not in the Muskokas? Why did you not bring that measure up to the Muskokas as well? They were safe in the gazebos, apparently. They were safe in the comfort of the gazebos. They were swimming in fake lakes and we'll never get an answer.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** They were swimming in the fake lake? I don't believe it.

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Were they swimming? I don't know. Well, they were reflecting by the fake lakes. Maybe they were reflecting on how much money they wasted, because we certainly were reflecting on it and continue to reflect on it.

Here was the Ontario government, in 2010, giving police powers that were designated as war measures. The powers under such legislation should not pre-emptively include all buildings. Instead, it should only protect necessary structures.

On top of everything, the PWPA does not have the authority to protect people or heads of state, as was the case during the G20. I'm sure that other legislation exists to this extent that would justify security measures such as a fence or a security perimeter around meetings of heads of state. I don't think the PWPA was that measure, though. So the government's intentions might have been good in principle, but are hard to justify in retrospect.

Therefore, it really is easy for us to support the repeal of the PWPA. Civil liberties groups have advocated for it. It was also one of the recommendations of the McMurry report. André Marin expressed reservations about it. It's hard to argue for the continuation of such an act in general. The question then arises: If we are removing this act, do we have to replace it with something else?

#### 0930

Here is where the government is proposing amendments to the Police Services Act which bring me to the second point. The act would amend the Police Services Act, but it's still aligned with the current powers granted to court security guards under the PWPA:

Require any person entering or inside a courthouse to produce identification and provide information to assess their security risk; give court security unnecessary powers that they do not need in their everyday job: There is no reason why court security should have the right to ask why a person is entering a court. What kinds of questions should be justifiable in assessing whether a person poses a security risk? The changes also call for searching a person who is entering, attempting to enter or in a courthouse, as well as the person's vehicle and other property. So does that mean that the parking lot of the courthouse is considered within the boundaries of such

powers? What if you're a visitor dropping someone else off at the court? Are you still subject to search by court security? Would these powers include the ability to search the car of a person entering the parking lot? What about groups or visitors to the courthouse? Would they be required to have ID with them while they're touring the courthouse?

Search, without a warrant, any person, property or vehicle entering or attempting to enter premises where court proceedings are conducted.

Search, without a warrant and using reasonable force if necessary, any person who is in custody where court proceedings are conducted or who is being transported to or from such premises, or any property in the custody or care of that person.

Mr. Speaker, the range of police powers conferred by the act which remain, in the case of the courthouse guards, should also be considered specifically. Will guards and peace officers be able to offer conclusive testimony about the location of the security boundaries, as was the case during the PWPA?

The legislation should strive to identify and distinguish between the different powers given to courthouse staff. A power to search may be necessary but not the power to detain or arrest or ask for identification. Each of these powers might be justified with the individual functions of the building. Not all courthouses, for example, need that much security. Not all courthouses are under that much threat. It is better to give these powers as need arises, instead of having to take them away or rely on the good judgment of those using them.

If we learned anything from the G20, Mr. Speaker, it is that when extra police powers are given to police officers, they tend to use them. I think that here we are giving court security staff wartime powers on a daily basis. I do not see how all courthouses in Ontario are under constant terrorist threat. These measures would only be justified if the risk of injury is extreme, and that is certainly not the case for a lot of courthouses. The default assumption should be that these powers are not available, and any additional powers should be specifically granted, rather than the proposal that all powers be granted and then taken away by regulation. The powers should also be time-specific.

Any random search power should be accompanied by a protocol to ensure that searches are truly random: for example, that all people are searched, or that only one third are searched. Any extension of search, detention or demand-of-identification powers should be posed so that individuals are provided with sufficient notice of the allowable procedures, should they decide to enter the premises.

The most troubling part, however, remains the fact that I see this as extending those same rights police had under PWPA to everyday courthouses in Ontario. This is not necessary and does not seem right.

We can then talk about the repeal of PWPA, because it clearly lives on in this current amendment. This is certainly troubling.

The third part of this act, Mr. Speaker, is the enactment of the Security for Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act. It narrows the list of public works even further. Unlike PWPA, the new bill covers very limited categories of infrastructure, and prescribing any additional categories of infrastructure would require amendments to the act.

First off, what are we designating as an electricity generating facility? Is it a solar farm? Is it a wind farm? Is it a nuclear facility? What context do we give those facilities?

The act designates security personnel at these facilities with the power to: request any person who wishes to enter or is on the premises to produce identification and provide information for the purposes of assessing the person's security risk; search, upon consent, any person, property or vehicle entering the premises; refuse to allow a person to enter or bring property into the premises and use reasonable force to prevent entry.

Guards could exercise the specific powers only on the premises, and these powers would not apply off the premises. Citizens are given the option to enter the premises or to leave. The powers outlined above no longer apply to the area approaching the facility. We certainly support that. We believe that people should be given the option to enter or to leave upon finding out what the requirements are for entry.

This was certainly not the case during the G20, when citizens were still required to provide ID, even after deciding they no longer wanted to enter. They were still arrested for wanting to do that. We're glad to see that provision go.

We do still have concerns about extending powers to security personnel at nuclear and electricity facilities. I repeat again that these are not police officers; they are privately trained security personnel. It's only normal that we should question and debate the extension of such powers given to them.

We look forward to seeing if the idea of the approach to a public works building is removed from the new act. It should not be left up to peace officers to determine what the approach to a building is.

While police have common law authority to conduct warrantless searches in specific situations, when warrantless searches are to be carried out on a regular basis, there should be specific statutory authority provided to give such powers.

Citizens were required to identify themselves and explain why they wanted to enter the security perimeter. Even if they changed their mind and no longer wanted to enter, they still had to provide ID and could be arrested or jailed.

The PWPA was enacted to protect public property and should not have been used to enact regulations to protect people, as was the case during the G20.

Other issues were at stake during the G20 beyond the outdated act. When the act was passed, the ministry had meant it to apply to an internal area around the security fence. The police understood it as applying to the entire

area around the security fence. As a matter of fact, they exercised the powers granted by the PWPA way beyond the security fence, even after the misinterpretation had been corrected. This certainly is a testament to the idea that police were granted powers that went beyond what was justifiable for the event.

Tempers flare as the situation escalates on both sides. The situation put more emphasis on the fact that government needs to be cautious of the curtailment of civil rights and of the powers it gives to police officers. It should be careful so that it can justify such powers. This was not the case during the G20.

Since Minister Meilleur herself admitted that it was an issue of miscommunication, I would look forward to seeing the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services develop a protocol that would call for public information campaigns when police powers are extended. I would also like to see written notices at the entrance of courthouses and nuclear facilities listing the possible requirements for entry and the consequence of disobeying those requirements.

There also needs to be an accountability mechanism in those instances where things do not go as planned. Security guards and police forces need to fully understand what they can and cannot do. They also need to know the consequences that their actions could elicit.

To conclude, during the G20, the government failed to weigh the security associated with protecting heads of state against the constitutional rights of the citizens of Ontario. A vague law means that individuals are not given sufficient guidance as to what behaviour a law prohibits. It also means that police officers are not given sufficient direction on how to enforce this law, which inevitably leads to inconsistent enforcement.

We support the repeal of the PWPA but have reservations as to the extra powers that are being given to court security and security at electricity generators. Wartime powers are being extended to security within our courts and around our electricity and nuclear generators. We need to look closely at what effects this will have on civil rights and those wishing to enter courthouses as simple observers.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member from Bramalea–Gore–Malton.

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** Let's be clear when speaking on Bill 34: At its heart, it's an attempt of this government to rectify a mistake that this government made. Now, this mistake wasn't simply a mistake involving an omission; this was a commission. This was a clear choice made by this government to use the public works act to give special powers to police officers during the G20. These special powers were kept secret and were not disclosed to the public.

0940

As protectors and caretakers of this province, it is incumbent on the government to provide the citizens of this province with the knowledge so that they can engage in their democratic rights. What right? The right to dissent. This is a fundamental part of the fabric of society of

all free societies. We need this right to engage our community, to ensure that there's oversight, to ensure that the public has a say on the actions of the government.

During G20, concerned citizens wanted to raise their voice. Some citizens simply were curious to see what was going on. Curious citizens, citizens who had a stake and individuals who wanted to raise their voice were all caught up in one of the largest mass arrests in the history of this country and the history of this province. Over 1,000 citizens—1,000 Canadians—were arrested, and the vast majority of these Canadians were not held on any charges, were kept in custody, civil rights abrogated, violated, and released days later with no charge. This is a disgrace. This is a black mark on the face of a democratic and free society. This was a heinous violation of civil rights.

Now, I support the repeal of the public works act. That is an outdated law which was simply abused and which provided the government with unfettered rights to war-measure-type powers at any time. This was an example of a state repressing its people, and the strong language is necessary to hold the government accountable for their actions. It's important to note that the powers granted by the PWPA were simply one piece to the puzzle, simply one component to the reason why there were mass civil rights violations.

We also have to look at the fact that police officers were not properly trained. There is still not proper police officer accountability. In terms of a culture, we must recognize and respect the right to dissent, and our officers must also be trained accordingly to respect citizens who wish to engage in that right and provide them with the dignity and a safe space to do so, not to present themselves as an obstacle to dissent but to present themselves as facilitators, or people who would assist in democracy.

Now, when this government chose to do the right thing, which was to correct this mistake, I applauded the government for taking that step. But in correcting one mistake, let's not make another mistake. In repealing the public works act, that's a positive step, but now what we're doing with the proposed amendment is providing the police, through the Police Services Act and the act governing the facilities which produce electricity, permanent powers that extend beyond what a police officer has and which are clearly in violation of our Charter of Rights, section 8, which guarantees the right to be free from unreasonable search and seizure.

What does that mean? That's a fundamental part of our society, that we are guaranteed these rights. This gives us the peace of mind that we can exist in this society, that we can flourish in this society, knowing that there won't be an unreasonable encroachment upon our privacy interests; there won't be an unreasonable search of our privacy, property or of our space.

We can break down the proposed enactment into two particular areas: courthouses and facilities that produce electricity. Beginning with the courthouse: Now, this government should be put on notice. They made a heinous mistake during the G20. They violated the citizens of

this province's rights, so they should be particularly aware and sensitive to protecting these rights. When they enacted this new law they should have taken the precaution to ensure that there wasn't any future potential to breach civil rights and that there wasn't any future potential to violate the rights of their citizens.

Now, if you look at the components of the bill that relate to courthouses, and the concept of a courthouse: In a free and democratic society, it is essential that we have public hearings and that we have public participation in the form of spectators who can attend a courthouse, who can observe, who can engage in and see the justice system unfold, who can observe as unofficial checks and balances on the system. There are many examples when the public has an interest in attending a court. If there is a protest and a colleague, an activist, a professor who speaks out on an issue is arrested unfairly, his or her colleagues may want to attend the court to show their solidarity and show their support. Other members of society, other citizens, may want to attend the court to see the proceedings to ensure that it's fair, to ensure that their colleague's rights are being protected, that their colleague is not being mistreated. That is an essential part of society when we have open and free courthouses. We want to engage the public. We want to make sure that the public feels welcome, feels that they can access these courts.

If we recognize that this is an important part of a free and democratic society and we recognize that we need to have public courthouses so the public can be spectators, can act as an unofficial check and balance, then we must acknowledge that a court should be kept in that fashion, should be kept in a fashion where the public can openly and easily access it and engage in it. This law provides security at the courthouse with the power to deny entry on a number of criteria. The most troubling is that they're able to ask questions to assess the security threat, which is an open discretion; there's no clear set of questions they can ask.

The security officer is given certain rights. They can search the person entering—there's a reasonable level to that, so that's acceptable. They can search the car of the person. What's the connection between a person attempting to enter a courthouse and then providing the court security officer the right to have a warrantless search of his or her vehicle? There is no connection there, and that's simply a violation of our section 8 rights.

Furthermore, this bill also allows security personnel to search the vehicle if an individual is a passenger in the vehicle. What's the connection to a friend of mine dropping me off at the courthouse, giving the court security the right to then search my friend's vehicle? Again, another violation of our section 8 rights.

What's the most troubling is that this bill provides court security with the right to ask questions to assess the security risk of an individual. What does that really mean? On the face of it, it seems quite simple and maybe not very troubling. But if we analyze this one step further and look at it with a critical lens, what does this mean?

Security personnel can say, "Why are you coming?" and any series of questions beyond that to assess their security risk. "What are your political beliefs? Do you believe that police are doing their job properly or not?" What if the person indicates that, "I'm here because I'm concerned with police powers, I'm concerned that there should be an independent body reviewing the police and I'd like to see if there is a case study to be made."

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Kick them out right away.

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** They might get kicked out immediately, then.

What's even more troubling is if a citizen wants to exercise his or her right to question society, to question whether or not the police are using their powers appropriately—and many officers are using their powers appropriately, but there are some that are not—if an individual wants to create this case study just to engage in their rights, wants to observe as a silent observer, as a spectator, and they provide this information that, "I'm here to do so," and they're asked to leave. This individual wants to defend democracy, defend their ability to engage in the democratic system, to assess the qualities of the police or their powers, and says, "No, I want to do my duty as a citizen. I want to sit silently in the courtroom and watch and see what happens." They can be arrested. They can be charged and arrested simply for wanting to come into a courthouse to engage in this process, to be a spectator. That's offensive.

What's more troubling is, the same government that has been criticized for violating civil rights is opening the door wide to future civil right violations, and not just any type of civil right violations, but permanent, because they are giving permanent powers to court security personnel and electricity producing facilities to have permanent carte blanche power to deny entry based on security threat or risk assessment questions.

**0950**

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Perhaps it's unintentional. I don't know.

**Interjection:** Maybe they just didn't think about it.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** But committee hearings might deal with that, right? That's what I think.

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** I think there's going to be a lot of work that needs to be done in committee hearings on this issue.

Whether it's a government, whether it's media personnel, as soon as the word "security" is used, as soon as there's a threat to security, it immediately creates a response of "Give away all your rights." If security is involved, then rights no longer matter. That's simply the wrong approach. In fact, as soon as we see the word "security," we should be extra mindful that rights aren't taken away. We should be extra mindful that this is not simply an excuse to violate our civil rights.

When it comes to our civil rights, we must cherish them and protect them because they are very fragile. Slow encroachments on these rights will eventually result in an eradication of rights that we've worked so hard to ensure that we have in a democratic and free society.

As Ontarians and as Canadians, we should lead in civil rights. We should not be falling behind. We should be the example of what it means to be in a free and democratic society, not the example when people point out what not to do.

As soon as we see the word “security” being used, and if this government says, “There’s a security risk and we need to ensure that security is protected at courthouses. We need to ensure that security is protected at electricity producing facilities,” then at that point we must be even more cognizant that each and every letter of the law does not encroach on our rights, that each and every section and article does not limit the rights of individuals to dissent, to engage in democracy, to question, to participate or to protest. These are fundamental aspects of our society, and security does not trump them. Security may require us to be more sensitive. Security may require us to be sometimes more aware, but it does not mean we step away from our civil rights, that we limit them, that we abrogate them.

We’ve seen what has happened in society when we look at security. Just in the panic of assessing security risks, we give away all our rights. We’ve seen the Patriot Act in the United States and the civil liberty violations that occur due to information being disseminated and gathered.

We’ve seen very recently in Canada that Minister Vic Toews wanted to present a law that was essentially going to violate all sorts of Internet privacy and give police unfettered access to our personal information when we surf the Net. In fact, the language that was used was a simplistic dichotomy of, “You’re either with us or against us. You’re either with the people who want to protect society or you’re with those who are criminals.” That’s not how simple this matter is. It’s a nuanced issue, and those who want to simplify this are seeking to invade and to violate our civil rights. Those who are prepared to stand up for civil rights, stand up for our democratic freedoms, must approach this in a nuanced manner and not be scared into a panic.

We’ve seen that the community rose up in rejection of the minister’s bill and that through the democratic process of dissent, through individuals expressing their concern, their rejection of this bill, rejection of this notion of giving police unfettered powers to invade our privacy, now the minister has taken a step back from that position. But it’s important that we don’t commit the same mistake here in Ontario.

The G20 opened our eyes. It opened our eyes to the fact that when we look at countries across the world and see there’s no freedom in Egypt—when people try to protest, they’re attacked and put into prisons. There’s no freedom in the Arab Spring countries. There’s no freedom in Latin American countries when people try to dissent. It became very shameful that we turned our faces, looked at our own homes and saw that there was not freedom here in Toronto. There was not freedom here in the streets of Toronto. When innocent protestors tried to raise their voices and concerns about global issues, they

were placed into custody. They were arrested and their rights were taken away.

The impact of that summer didn’t end that summer, it didn’t end a year later and it’s not over today. The injury and the harm that was a result of what happened during that summer will stay in the minds of people for their entire lives.

Many people spoke out and said, “We thought this was not the face of Canada. This is not the Canada we wanted to live in. This is not the Toronto that we grew up in, and we’re deeply saddened and disgraced.”

**Interjection:** It was a war zone.

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** It was a war zone; the member’s absolutely correct. It was a war zone, and it was a war zone on our own citizens, our own people. It wasn’t a foreign invader; it was our own people. We treated our own people with disrespect, with disgrace. It was inhuman. The treatment of individuals, the way they were kept in temporary holding cells, in temporary holding facilities, was simply unacceptable. It was shameful.

And that’s why I highlight that concern: Because we have another G20 brewing if this bill passes without any regulations or without any committee hearing amendments. We have another G20 brewing if there is a controversial court case that may involve any number of issues, whether criminal, whether an environmental lawsuit, whether a lawsuit of concerned farmers. If these individuals want to protest, want to rally, and they go to the courthouse to show their solidarity, a G20 can occur again, because we have here in this bill a wide set of powers granted that would limit the ability of citizens to engage in this process, whether it’s at a courthouse or at an electricity producing facility.

Let’s turn our minds now to a power plant, for example. We’ve seen an example of this very recently, here in Mississauga. Citizens were concerned about a power plant being built in their backyard, a power plant that this government footed the bill for, spent millions of dollars on and now has backtracked on, but it was because of the people, who were not initially properly given an opportunity for assessment and for their input. What they did, the citizens of Mississauga—and I applaud them, first, for engaging in their rights, for protesting, for exercising their democratic freedoms. They were upset about the building of a power plant and they protested, and that’s their right. They put up a fight. They stood together in solidarity and they said, “We don’t want this in our backyard.” By doing so, their voices were heard, and this government listened to their citizens for once, listened to their residents, and said, “Okay, we’ll stop.”

Now, if this bill existed, if this power existed, what would happen with those people rallying? They would all be asked, depending on the definition of entry into this power plant—if they were at the front of it and they were standing in the parking lot, perhaps a parking lot would meet the definition of entry. If they were in the parking lot and they were asked by power plant personnel, “Why are you here?” and they said, “We’re here because we don’t want this power plant built,” that might have satis-

fied their minds that this was a security risk, because "They don't want it to be built. They may be a security risk. Let's ask them to leave." The residents are saying, "Hey, this is our backyard. We're here to protest. We don't want to leave. We want to protest, because we don't want this built." They're arrested and taken into custody. Another G20 occurs, another violation of the rights of citizens who want to protest, who want to raise their voice.

Mr. Speaker, that's unacceptable. I won't let that happen. I will fight for that, and I'm sure my colleagues will. I know my colleagues across the way will as well. We want to ensure that this is a free and democratic province; that people can protest; that people like the residents in Mississauga who protested against that power plant are able to do so, are not limited from doing so, are not placed in custody, are not arrested for doing so; that individuals who want to protest—actually, another great example: People who were improperly arrested in G20 are still going through the court process, are still currently involved in their trials.

Now, perhaps their colleagues want to show their solidarity and say, "Listen, this was completely unacceptable. My friend, my sister, my brother, my colleague was arrested while they were peacefully protesting. I want to be in the courtroom to show my solidarity, to show my support of my friend, to give them some courage, to show them that I care." Now, if they want to attend the court and there's this new bill enacted, and they indicate that, "Hey, I was there with my friend in G20, and I was against what happened. The police were wrong for what they did," and if the security personnel says, "Hey, they were in G20. They must be some sort of radical that needs to be prevented from coming into the courthouse," then they've precluded this individual. What if they want to be there? What if they really want to show their support? Again, we have another opportunity that our civil rights will be violated, and this is unacceptable.

1000

In closing, repealing the first part of the bill—I applaud the government for taking the right step. But let's not forget: It's this very same government that made the mistake in the first place, so they're simply correcting their own mistake. That's good, but it doesn't deserve applause. That's simply correcting a mistake.

But what's very troubling is that we have to keep in mind that when they are correcting their mistake—which is good; you have to do that—let's not make another mistake. Let's have some foresight now. You've had it before you. You've seen what happens when you make mistakes. Let's now be a little bit more cognizant of civil rights, be supportive of democracy, be supporters and caretakers of freedom and ensure that your bill does not create more civil rights violations. Let's have that foresight now.

With respect to repealing the Public Works Protection Act, I completely support that, and I will vote in favour of that. That's very important. But when it comes to courthouse security and electricity-producing-facility

security, those are two areas that need to be looked at very carefully.

I urge all members of the House to contact stakeholders who are civil liberty individuals who are aware of these rights and freedoms and consult with them—

**Interjection:** Who care about democracy.

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** Who care about democracy. Let's ensure that they're consulted properly because our charter rights are essential. People who are aware of the charter rights, perhaps some lawyers, can assess and we can have their input. It's important that we protect these rights.

This is no laughing matter, no joking matter. This is a serious matter because I believe in these freedoms, and I believe everyone in the House should and does. Let's ensure that we protect our freedoms moving forward and ensure that people are able to engage in the political process and keep our public courthouses free and open so that the community can observe as spectators. Let's keep our power plants accessible to our communities so that they can raise their voices and their concerns if they see it so. Let's ensure that we have a society that encourages democracy instead of stifling it.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Questions and comments?

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** This wasn't the annual general meeting of the Camp Fire Girls going on in downtown Toronto. This was almost every vulnerable head of state with the highest vulnerability to terrorist attacks, bombings and assassinations ever in Canada. We saw what happened in Quebec City. We saw what happened in Seattle. We saw innocent people blown up in subways in London. We saw a government fall in Spain over the mishandling of bombings and terrorism. We saw 9/11. It was in that context.

The members opposite asked who the enemy was. They were terrorists, murderers and an international effort to undermine democracy. You want to see real problems with civil liberties? Look at the Patriot Act: rendition and racial profiling. The US has almost suspended amendment 4 of its own Constitution.

This was the worst-organized international event by the federal government. I was mayor of a city when we had War Child, 37 heads of state and the Pan Am Games—and the Tories are laughing. No government, I can say, was more incompetent. In Winnipeg, with the Pan Am Games and with the War Child International UN conference, we had a year of security planning.

I will tell you, as a mayor of a large city, there are things you don't do. You do not put major international conferences in the downtown of cities like Toronto after the experiences of Spain and London, where there was no conference. Why? There's more conduits and subways. There are more porches in high buildings. If you wanted the perfect environment for terrorism, you had downtown Toronto. The mayor of the day said, if you're going to host it in the city, why not put it over by the Ex where the water and the freeway exclude it? I will tell you, having been briefed by CSIS and by security people:

This was lunacy. It was forced upon the city and the province and a mayor who, I thought, showed great courage, and a police chief who scrambled for 60 days to make sure President Obama wasn't shot.

I am still fighting for civil liberties rights for my constituents because this happened in my neighbourhood, where police officers, with no control of this government, arrested a woman who left her children at home when she was going to pick up milk because she didn't have ID.

We don't need lectures from the opposition on this. Where were you? For 50 years of other parties in power, this legislation was on the books. This government was asked to act, and we were the party who brought in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The Conservatives took away the charter challenges act.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. John O'Toole:** I'll try to tone down the rhetoric a bit, because I find that is quite inflammatory. This minister of the McGuinty government is an embarrassment.

I'm responding to the two members from the NDP: the member from Essex and the member from Bramalea-Gore-Malton. What I'm trying to say is, they brought a couple of very good points. They emphasized the civil liberties parts of it. I thought they did a respectable job. But let's face it: The report is in response to both the Ombudsman's report as well as the work done by a former Attorney General for the province of Ontario, Solicitor General Roy McMurtry, a very highly respected person.

I think all of these things are being implemented as a result of an act that was in place, the Public Works Protection Act, as was said by the speakers, in 1939. We're, in a general sense, very supportive of that. But what I heard being said was blaming someone else for everything. It's a typical response from a McGuinty—especially from the leadership team. They blame somebody else for everything.

When I look at Ontario, and when you talked about security around power plants, in my riding, there are two nuclear plants in Durham: Pickering and Darlington. It's a very important issue. We support the idea of improved security and security processes and procedures. We commend the government for looking at that and updating the legislation. This is not about blaming.

But here is what they did with power plants: During the election, and basically just before it, to prime the area for their members, they cancelled two power plants in Mississauga. Those Mississauga plants saved a seat. We call them seat-saver decisions.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. John O'Toole:** No, but the fact is, this was brought up. Their decision about power today is another example of a government that is ruining the electricity system of Ontario. Energy is doubling in price for people who can hardly afford it. This is the real issue about this government, and I pay attention to what they say.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member from Trinity-Spadina.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** I was fascinated by the response from the member from Toronto Centre. He, in some ways, is correct in terms of attacking the federal government. He didn't talk about the billion-dollar expenditure which he got away with. He didn't talk about that, but he talked about a few other things. To some extent, I'm in agreement. But he takes absolutely no responsibility for his own government and deflects attention from himself and them, and then points the finger and says, "Where were you?" I just don't understand that. That was a fascinating pointing of fingers.

There was not one mention of what his government had done. It appears as if there is absolutely no remorse for the worst violation of human and civil rights here in Ontario committed by this government. There was not one mention of that and not one mention of the potential violation of civil rights that the member from Bramalea-Gore-Malton raises, along with the member from Essex, in terms of what this bill could do in the future. There was not one mention of that.

I anticipate that other members who are paying attention might speak to it—I don't know—but they will have an opportunity, when this bill goes into committee and while we have public hearings, to hear from people who might be concerned. Amendments will be introduced, because we will certainly have amendments, and hopefully this bill will be improved and can correct the injustices that the citizens of Ontario suffered but a mere two years ago.

I congratulate my friends from Essex and Bramalea-Gore-Malton for their critique of this bill.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member from Peterborough.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. I did appreciate the thoughtful comments—and I want to recognize them as very thoughtful comments—from the members from Essex and Bramalea-Gore-Malton.

I just want to take the opportunity for a moment. I've had the opportunity to visit the three nuclear facilities in Ontario: Bruce at Kincardine, Pickering and Darlington. The Darlington site is about 50 kilometres from my riding in Peterborough. Obviously, this bill will go to committee. So I do hope that the committee would take the time to perhaps visit all of those three communities, or one or two of those communities, to seek the opinion of those individuals who are in those particular communities where we have nuclear facilities: Darlington, Pickering and indeed Bruce.

It was my information, when I took the opportunity to do it—I remember that actually the member from Trinity-Spadina toured Darlington with me as part of a committee on a piece of legislation.

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** He's a good man.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** He is a good man, and I recall that that day OPG security were there, and they certainly indicated to us the potential threats that we might have to our nuclear facilities in the province of Ontario. I could

spend my time this morning talking about a litany of what those security risks might be. But I think it would behoove us all, when this bill goes to committee, to really take the opportunity to visit those communities, to understand what's going on in those communities and to really get an accurate risk and threat assessment when it comes to those three communities in the province of Ontario and, indeed, the communities that surround those three sites. That's what I believe the advantage of a minority government is. The committee can go there, and we can hear first-hand what the challenges are and, as we improve this bill, hear what those communities are saying.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Response?

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** I would like to acknowledge who spoke in response and continue this debate. Thank you for your input and for your responses.

Some of the remarks that were made—I think it's important to get community input, and so I acknowledge the member's remarks with respect to that. It's very important; it's essential. In a democracy, we need to hear from the communities that are affected, and they should be consulted. So that's vital.

Another issue that was raised—and I want to spend some time speaking on this issue—is, when I spoke of the word “security” and the fact that security is a word that's used to substantiate and to justify violations of civil rights, another word is also used for that, and that's “terrorist.” Immediately, just by invoking that word, it somehow justifies civil rights violation; it does not. Using the word “terrorist” does not mean that you can arrest innocent people. Using the word “terrorist” does not mean that you can violate civil rights. It's not acceptable.

There are real threats that exist, and they should be analyzed in a rational, reasonable way, not with fear-mongering, not with panic, not with an abrogation of rights. That's not the appropriate approach, and that's not the approach that should be taken in this House and that's not the approach that we should take as legislators.

We should be reasonable, we should be rational, and we should engage our critical thinking when any issue arises, particularly when it involves the rights of our citizens. There should be no catchphrases that can be utilized to justify giving away our rights, whether it's “security” or whether it's “terrorism.”

Again, I urge all members in the House to be very cognizant of the effect of every letter of every law in this House and assess whether or not it protects democracy or if it rejects, denies or suppresses democracy, because we stand here for freedom.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The time for the morning debate has come to an end.

*Second reading debate deemed adjourned.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** This House stands recessed till 10:30.

*The House recessed from 1014 to 1030.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** A lot of you folks may know that my beautiful granddaughter Rachel is a page here. Today she's a page captain, and she's joined in the members' gallery by her dad, Derek Rynard; her sisters, Karley and Madison Rynard; her mom, Jill; and my beautiful wife, Jane Dunlop.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** We all know that the member is not old enough to be a grandfather.

Introduction of guests?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I am delighted that the Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario is joining us in the Legislature today. We're joined by Doris Grinspun, the executive director; David McNeil, the president of RNAO; and president-elect Rhonda Seidman-Carlson. Let's give them all a big welcome to the Legislature.

**Mr. Jim McDonell:** It's with great pride that we have the opportunity to have, from our riding, page captain for the day Ryan Haley. To witness this, his parents, Joanne and Bob, are here today, along with his brother Derek and his cousin Andrew Stang. We welcome them to the Legislature.

**Hon. Charles Sousa:** I'd like to welcome to the Legislature today Mr. Dave Fletcher. He's the general manager of Holcim, and also the chairman of CASIA, a local environmental association of industry and resident associations. With him today is Sherry Fletcher. She's an attorney in the state of Georgia, and also a student of politics who pays great interest to parliamentary procedure. Welcome to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

**Mr. Jerry J. Ouellette:** I'd ask all of you to join me in welcoming Marianne Cochrane, who's a strong advocate of the faith and the nursing community, here to Queen's Park today.

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** I want to introduce some relatives of page Mariam who are here. Her grandparents Syed and Zahida Murtaza are in the gallery. Her sister Laila Vahed and her two cousins Sakeena and Manaal Syed are in the gallery. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**Ms. Laurie Scott:** I'd also like to welcome a constituent, Jill Staples, who's down here today with the RNAO.

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** J'aimerais souhaiter la bienvenue à M. Paul-André Gauthier, qui vient de Sudbury et de Nickel Belt, et qui est ici dans le cadre de la RNAO. Ça me fait plaisir de lui souhaiter la bienvenue à Queen's Park.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I would like to very much welcome to the Legislature some family friends: Dave Johnson—he'll be joined by his wife, Erin, and Erin's dad, Hugh. Dave had a life-threatening accident last September. He was airlifted by Ornge from Huntsville to St. Mike's hospital. He received superb care and is now receiving rehab at Royal Vic in Barrie.

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** Certainly, I want to join in the very warm welcome of Mr. David McNeil, the president of RNAO; also, of course, Dr. Doris Grinspun, the executive director; and the many, many dedicated, hard-working nurses who are here today on the RNAO's 13th

annual Queen's Park day. We look forward to meeting with you today.

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** I also want to introduce some members of RNAO from Ottawa, who are visiting Queen's Park today: Una Ferguson, Andrea Jewell and Cécile Diby. I look forward to attending their breakfast next Friday in Ottawa. Welcome to Queen's Park.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further introductions?

If I have this right, on behalf of the member from Mississauga—Streetsville, we have grandmothers Zubeda Vahed and Zahida Murtaza; grandfather Syed Murtaza; uncle Ziyaad Vahed; sister Laila Vahed; and cousins Sakeena Syed and Manaal Syed. They will be here in the members' gallery supporting the page. Welcome.

It is now time for oral questions.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** To the Minister of Health: The minister insists that she has acted decisively by requesting a police investigation into financial irregularities at Ornge, even though she ignored our warnings for months. She boasts of installing new leadership at Ornge, and yet the two key individuals who were responsible for decisions that compromised patient safety and wasted millions of public health care dollars are still in charge today of day-to-day operations.

Can the minister tell us: Are Mr. Rick Potter and Mr. Steve Farquhar still employed at Ornge today, and if so, why?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you to the member for the question.

What I can tell you, Speaker, is that we found some very serious problems at Ornge. When those problems came to light, we took decisive action. What have we done? We have replaced the leadership at Ornge. We have a new CEO in place: Deputy Minister Ron McKerlie. We have a very strong new board in place, headed by Ian Delaney. We have sent in a forensic audit team, who put in a very large team to comb through the books at Ornge. The results of that audit led us to having to take the very significant step of referring this matter to the OPP for further investigation.

We are moving forward on changes at Ornge—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Well, Speaker, this is the very reason why front-line staff at Ornge have lost all confidence in this minister. They know the role that Mr. Potter played in destroying the reputation of our air ambulance service, and they also know what the minister knows now: namely, that in addition to his disastrous operational decisions, Mr. Potter falsified his own credentials and repeatedly lied about them. They heard the minister say

that she was appalled by Mr. Potter's representations and that she was hopeful that they would be acted on.

I ask the minister, how can she expect front-line staff to have confidence in her leadership when she stands by and allows Mr. Potter to remain in his very key role on the front line of operations at Ornge?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I have every confidence in the new leadership at Ornge. They are taking decisive steps that are making a real difference on the front lines.

I have now visited three Ornge bases. I have had wonderful conversations with front-line staff, who are telling me what it was like and telling me what it is like now. They are seeing the results of the changes that we have made at Ornge. The new leadership is doing its work.

What I can tell you is, the front-line staff, after my having visited three bases and spoken to many of those front-line staff, are very, very pleased with the changes that I have made in the leadership at Ornge.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Mr. Frank Klees:** It's precisely this kind of hands-off attitude that got us into the mess that we're in today. The reality is that those front-line people that the minister is meeting with have lost confidence in her because she is afraid to make a decision about things like Mr. Potter.

Yesterday, the minister was asked this question during the scrum following question period: "What would happen if this happened in your office, if someone in your office misrepresented their credentials?" The minister's response was this, and I quote from the transcript: "Uh, I would fire them."

1040

I ask the minister: If Mr. Potter would be fired from her office for lying, why is he not fired from Ornge?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I have every confidence in the new leadership team that has come forward to serve the people of Ontario. The new board, which the minister opposite called a very strong board and a big important step forward when they were first announced—he is now determined to undermine the integrity of those very people who have come forward to resolve the challenges at Ornge. I stand by the board. They are doing their work. They are being very diligent and they are being very proactive. I have the deepest confidence in the leadership of the board, including Ian Delaney, Charles Harnick, Patricia Lang, Barry McLellan, Maneesh Mehta, Patrice Merrin, and Patricia Volker. These are very fine individuals who are determined to do what the people of Ontario have asked them to do.

### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Speaker, it's the same story over and over again. The minister had confidence in the last board until she had to fire them all because she refused to take action. But that's why this Legislature has to take a leadership role.

This morning, at a joint press conference, the member from Nickel Belt and I called on this Legislature to strike an all-party select committee through which the Legislature would be empowered to conduct hearings into the circumstances that led to the scandal at Ornge.

Following her February 17 press conference on Ornge, the minister gave her commitment that she would co-operate if the Legislature wanted to strike a committee to investigate Ornge. Will the minister honour that commitment today and express her support for the all-party select committee that we called for this morning?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I am fully supportive of any decision this Legislature makes. If it's the will of this Legislature that that happen, I will, of course, be totally supportive of that.

I can tell you, however, that I'm focused on making changes now. For me, what's important is that we continue to build a stronger Ornge. We are fixing the problems that existed and we are taking steps to ensure this does not happen again. We are developing a new performance agreement that will have much stronger oversight, that will have whistle-blower protection. It will allow us, the government, to appoint members to the board and it will give us much more oversight.

We will be bringing the force of legislation. I will be introducing legislation in fairly short order to entrench that sense of responsibility and transparency in law.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Speaker, we welcome the minister's agreement here in this chamber this morning to support the striking of an all-party select committee. Thank you. We look forward to that.

The reason, Speaker, that that is so important is that we continue to hear from front-line people—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from St. Catharines will come to order.

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Speaker, the member for St. Catharines has just stated that I have misinterpreted the minister's remarks. In that case, I will ask the minister one more time and I will ask for clarification: Will the minister support our call for an all-party select committee on Ornge?

*Applause.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Thank you.

Minister.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Let me repeat: I support the will of this Legislature, and if it is the will of this Legislature, then I will be supportive. There will be committees that will have ample opportunity; public accounts will look at the Auditor General's report, for example.

I just want to be clear that I have been in conversation with the Auditor General and I have exercised section 17 of the Auditor General Act. I have asked the Auditor General to report back on this audit as quickly as possible.

We need to get all of the information. We need to move forward on cleaning up what was going on at Ornge, and the support of the Auditor General is a key part of that.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplement—

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Speaker, I will not presume on the vote in this Legislature, but I can tell you this: There will come a time very soon when this Legislature will be voting to strike an all-party select committee of the Legislature, and unless I have miscounted, I believe that even if not one member of the Liberal caucus votes in favour of that, it will be the will of the Legislature that that all-party committee will be struck.

We look forward to the work of that committee, because under the terms of reference of that committee, employees both past and future will be able to come forward and tell their stories about the mismanagement and abuse, and they will have the protection of the terms of reference of that committee.

We look forward to holding this government accountable for their lack of oversight and their lack of accountability on this issue.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Please be seated.

Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I'm not sure I heard a question there, but let me reassure the member that we will fully participate. The will of the Legislature rules supreme, and I will not presume to predict the will of this Legislature.

Speaker, we've taken a lot of steps to get to the bottom of this—in fact, the rather extraordinary step of calling in the Ontario Provincial Police.

I'm still waiting for the member opposite to actually give me advice on what to do that I have not already done. The only advice he has offered is to maybe paint the helicopters a different colour and change the name.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. Ontarians want to see their government confront the challenges that they're facing. In tough times, they want to see their priorities at the top of the government's list. What message are they hearing when they read in the news that executives at Ornge were paid seven-figure salaries to run an air ambulance service that often can't get helicopters into the air?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Well, Speaker, I think the member opposite knows that it was when that salary figure was revealed—that is what triggered a series of events.

I think the people opposite know that we were trying very hard to get access to those salary figures. We were stonewalled. The Auditor General of the province of Ontario was stonewalled. The Auditor General was stonewalled.

It was then that I took action. I called the senior leadership of Ornge into my office. I told them that I fully expected them to co-operate with the requests from my ministry and from the Auditor General. It was then that things started to become very clear that there were deeper problems at Ornge than simply egregious salaries.

That matter is now in the hands of the OPP.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Well, families should be surprised by this scandal, but the sad thing is, many aren't surprised. They watch an out-of-touch government that, year after year after year, asks them to pay more and expect less. They see well-connected insiders getting lucrative tax giveaways and sky-high salaries or, in the case of Ornge, they see widespread abuse of money that could have been put into hiring nurses, easing wait times and helping patients.

What does this Minister of Health have to say to those people?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** What I can tell you is that the people of this province want us to move forward on the elements of the action plan that I released just a few weeks ago. At the heart of that action plan is providing better care for our elderly people. There are too many people, many of them elderly, who are not getting the best possible care. That's why we need to reorganize our health care system so that it works from the perspective of the patient.

Our plan is to put significantly more resources into home care, into community care, to build the continuum of supports so that people get all the care they need and they get the best possible care in a far more coordinated manner.

I'm looking forward to implementing the action plan. It's what the people of Ontario want me to do.

1050

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, this minister is asking Ontario families to accept some tough choices in the budget, along with her finance minister colleague and the Premier of this province. That's what that group is doing. They're telling people there's going to be tough choices ahead.

Do you know what? The people of the province, I believe, are actually ready to step up to the plate. But when they're asked to pay higher user fees and unfair new taxes while at the same time they watch emergency rooms close, they watch wait-lists grow for things like long-term care, so that health dollars in this province can be spent on luxury hotels and executive chefs, their goodwill starts to go out the window, and rightfully so.

Is this government—is this Premier—ready to tell this minister that it's time for her to leave this post because she has made one heck of a mess out of it?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Minister of Health.

*Applause.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Thank you.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order, please.

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** She thinks it's funny.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Nepean—Carleton, come to order, please. Thank you. Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, let me tell you that, no, I am not going to resign, and I am absolutely focused on the issues that matter to the people of this province. People in Ontario are receiving far better health care than they did when we took office.

The RNAO is here today. They remember the days when the other party was in charge, when 10,000 nurses left Ontario for jobs in the US. We have reversed that, Speaker; we are now hiring 14,000. We've got 14,000 more nurses than we had when we took office. We've got 3,400 more doctors working in this province. We've got more than 1,000 more nurse practitioners. We've cut wait times in half.

But I can tell you there is more to do, and that is what our action plan is all about. It's about strengthening supports for people in their community, in their home, so they get the care they—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, in this week's chapter—I'm sorry; this is back to the Minister of Health—of the Ornge saga, we learn that the government cannot account for \$25 million of public money.

For over a year, the government ducked and dodged tough questions about Ornge, and now they expect families to believe that they're going to actually clean up the mess.

My question is a simple one: Where are the consequences when these kinds of messes occur?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I do want to clarify that that \$25 million has been accounted for. This whole matter is in the hands of the Ontario Provincial Police. That is where this matter belongs. I want to respect their investigation, and I will not get into any details about that investigation because I, Speaker, want justice to be done.

I can tell you that I am moving forward. The people on the front line are seeing the difference that the new management is bringing to Ornge. People are getting the care—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** —and that's what the people of this province expect.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, at the very least, Premier McGuinty and his health minister turned the other way as executives at Ornge frittered away tens of millions of public dollars on for-profit private schemes.

Health care professionals, many of whom are in the room right now, deserve an apology for the squandering

of resources that could have funded vital public health care programs across our province.

Do you know who else needs an apology? The public deserve an apology. The public, who are told to expect longer wait times, fewer nurses and higher user fees, deserve much better than what they're getting from this health minister.

Do you know what? The Premier was ready to actually show that there were some consequences when the eHealth scandal broke. Why are there no consequences this time?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Well, I would say there have been pretty significant consequences for the former leadership at Ornge: They no longer work there.

What I can tell you is that we did uncover a very problematic situation at Ornge, so we took decisive action. We took what is a very unusual step of sending in a forensic audit team. You will recall they were there for several weeks, a team of over 30 people. They did their work, and it got to the point where it was time to turn it over, because the people of this province should expect the highest possible value for the money they spend on health care. They were not getting the best value at Ornge, and that is why we have taken very strong steps to make sure that Ornge is able to provide the vital, life-saving services that it provides.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, for over a year, the Minister of Health has avoided tough questions on Ornge. At every turn she has avoided the tough questions. Now, at a time when the government is asking families to accept health care changes that could lead to layoffs, ER closures and longer wait times, the Premier all of a sudden wants the same minister to lead the change. The people of Ontario, Speaker, are hungry for change that actually makes their lives better. Instead, the Premier has offered them change that hands a well-connected insider a seven-figure salary.

If the Premier really wanted to show change around here, he would show that there are real consequences by actually changing up the cabinet. That's what the Premier should do. Are they ready to change up the cabinet on that side of the House?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I completely reject the prognosis of the member opposite. We are looking to improve the quality of care and continue to make progress on wait times.

I don't know where she's coming up with the idea of user fees, but they are not in our plan. Our plan is clear: Let's get better value with the money that we are spending on health care.

No one will say we are getting best value. Everyone says we can get much better value with the money that we are spending, and no one knows that better than the nurses that are here with us today. They know if we focus on prevention, they know if we focus on stronger primary care, they know if we focus on evidence, we can get much better care and better value for our money.

## WHISTLE-BLOWER PROTECTION

**Ms. Sylvia Jones:** Back to the Minister of Health: When Ron McKerlie threatened Ornge staff with jail time for anyone speaking out, it sent a very strong message that someone is more interested in suppressing information than shedding light on Ornge.

After that threat, we received an email from a former employee that states: "Given the article in the Star, I am reluctant to come to Queen's Park to meet." As a result, I've tabled a resolution that will be debated this afternoon calling on the Legislative Assembly committee to strengthen whistle-blower legislation to ensure that current and past employees are protected when they appear before committees.

Minister, will you support my resolution?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I think members of this House know that people appearing before committee do have immunity. They have the same exemption that we in this House have.

I do support whistle-blower legislation. In fact, that is why we will be incorporating whistle-blower protection in our new performance agreement as we go forward. We think it's important that people in organizations do have a voice, and we want to protect those whistle-blowers.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Sylvia Jones:** Minister, we're tired of waiting for you to act. Ethical Ornge employees who saw what was happening and quit in disgust were forced to sign confidentiality agreements, effectively muzzling them. Now, current employees are being threatened with jail time simply because they want to share what the problems are. Clearly, someone doesn't want these individuals to reveal the truth at Ornge.

Will you stand with the NDP and PC caucuses and reassure whistle-blowers that they will be protected when they speak up?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I'm disappointed that once again the members opposite are giving us only part of the information. What is important is that Ron McKerlie, the CEO of Ornge, did have a conversation with employees when the OPP investigation began. He wanted employees to understand that there was an OPP investigation under way and that they had a responsibility to co-operate with the OPP and not to jeopardize the investigation.

I support whistle-blower protection. We are going to be having whistle-blower protection in our new agreement with Ornge.

1100

## AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** To the Minister of Health: Transport Canada records show that helicopters operated by Ornge are owned by a numbered corporation, 7506406 Canada Inc. Bankruptcy records show that's a for-profit company. Why is a for-profit company still operating?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, the member opposite, I'm sure, knows that one of the instructions that I gave to the new board was to wind down the for-profit entities that had been created under the previous legislation. That is a process that is under way. It cannot be done all at once. You can imagine there are significant legal, accounting—various things that have to happen in order for that to be done in a responsible way that respects taxpayer dollars.

I can reiterate that all for-profits are being wound down, but they're being wound down in a responsible, respectful way.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Transport Canada says that as of yesterday, 7506406 Canada Inc. owns Ornge helicopters. Why is Dr. Chris Mazza still listed as a board director on the numbered company? Does Mazza stay or does Mazza go?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I can tell you that Dr. Chris Mazza is no longer affiliated with Ornge. I can also reiterate that we are winding down the for-profits. But I think the people of this province expect us to do that in a way that respects the value of their tax dollars. The new leadership at Ornge is moving to wind down those for-profits. Some have already been wound down and gone into bankruptcy. Chris Mazza is no longer affiliated with Ornge.

#### POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** My question is for the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities. Minister, as a member with Carleton University in my riding of Ottawa Centre and three other post-secondary institutions in Ottawa, I know that the bright young innovators who will pass through our universities and colleges are key to Ontario's future prosperity in a globally competitive and increasingly knowledge-based economy.

As we reposition Ontario's economy to leverage this new reality, Ontario's post-secondary institutions must play a role in fostering an environment of innovation and provide tools for students to take ideas and turn them into exciting new products. If you put the skills and knowledge that our system is equipping these young people with to work, we will see the next generation of home-grown innovators ready to take the world by storm.

Would the minister tell us how the government is helping to position post-secondary institutions to help our young people?

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** In addition to adding 260,000 places in our universities and colleges and introducing the 30% tuition reduction, we realized that we had to do more.

My friend from Ottawa Centre has been leading something called the Ottawa Young Entrepreneurs initiative, which is a \$2-million initiative into Algonquin, La Cité and other post-secondary institutions. This is a program that hooks up business leaders as mentors and attaches young, promising students to them to create jobs. This is

responsible right now—4% of our businesses, which are our start-ups, are often being set up by young students coming out of high school with a company already started. They're creating over 40% of the new jobs in Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Yasir Naqvi:** Thanks, Minister, for sharing a very good example from my riding and the post-secondary institutions in Ottawa.

Being an entrepreneur is tough but rewarding, and it's the ideas and innovations developed in this type of environment that can lead to creating the next high-growth company, like OneChip Photonics in Ottawa.

Speaker, through you to the minister, can he tell us how we are supporting these successful hubs at our institutions and how they are creating the next generation of jobs in Ontario?

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** I want to thank the member for Ottawa Centre. I also want to acknowledge the member for Cambridge, who also recently visited the Digital Media Zone at Ryerson, and I think complimented President Levy on it.

The Digital Media Zone is where students are graduating with their incorporation papers for their new business and their certificate at the same time, their graduation diploma. It has attracted major capital from the United States, from Silicon Valley, and has led to a series of spinoffs.

One of the graduates from the University of Ottawa and one of the graduates from the University of Waterloo, in both those members' areas, recently—less than five years ago—started a company called Xtreme Labs. Now, that was before there were iPhones, before there was Twitter and before there were Android phones. This company now employs 700 people in Ontario and is one of hundreds of new businesses generating some of our highest job growth in years.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** My question also is to the Minister of Health. On Tuesday, you were caught unaware of the fact that Ornge helicopters do not have FAA clearance to enter the United States. That the minister was unaware of a public safety issue of that magnitude was shocking. However, my question today is: Now that that information has become public, does the minister agree that the public has the right to know about a public safety issue of this magnitude?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** When the member opposite had a document she revealed in this House earlier this week, it was a document that had not received signoff at the ADM level. It had not come to my office. So the fact that I was unaware of a document that had not come to my office—the member opposite, having been a former Minister of Health, would know that I would not be expected to have that information.

But I did get that information very quickly. What I have learned is that it is true that 10 new AgustaWestland

helicopters do have Transport Canada approval. They are in the process of getting FAA approval. All of the other fleets can move into the States. The fixed-wing airplanes can fly into the States. The old Sikorsky planes that serve in the north can go into the States. This is a process that is under way, and contingency plans have been put in place.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** Mr. Speaker, again to the Minister of Health: That acknowledgment of the fact that you didn't know is an indication of your lack of ability to provide the oversight that is necessary.

However, I want to address an issue—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order.

Member?

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** I want to address the consequence of raising that issue. We have become aware that in the two days since the issue was raised—in fact, everybody in the public service knows this now—there has been a witch hunt launched to find the person responsible for informing us and, by extension, the public. I want to ask you, Minister, can you tell this House who authorized the witch hunt?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** What I can tell you is that I did get the information that the member opposite raised. She might be interested to know that of the 19,000 patient transports that Ornge performed last year, one was a helicopter trip to the United States. We take this seriously. We take the issue seriously. We take patient safety seriously.

It's important that the people of this province—like Dave, my friend in the gallery, who got the care he needed when an emergency struck.

We are determined to make things stronger at Ornge. That work is under way, and I'm proud of the progress that's being made.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question. The member from Nickel Belt.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Look, the yelling back and forth doesn't help me. It doesn't help anyone who needs to hear the question or the answer. Bring it down, please.

Member from Nickel Belt.

1110

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** Ma question est pour la ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée.

Transport Canada records show that helicopters operated by Ornge are owned by a numbered company—7506406 Canada, if you're interested. According to information from Industry Canada, Chris Mazza is listed on the board of directors of that corporation. Can the minister tell us: Is Mr. Mazza still profiting from Ornge?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I'm not sure how different that was, Speaker, from the question that was already

asked by the party opposite. Nonetheless, Ornge is winding down the for-profit companies that were established under the previous leadership. We think it's important to have a not-for-profit service at Ornge that is focused on air and land transportation of critically ill patients. The people of this province want that to be a not-for-profit entity, and that's what we are working towards.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** My question was specific as to: Is Mr. Mazza still profiting, making money, off of Ornge? The minister stood up in this House many, many times and told us that those for-profits are being wound down. But from this side of the House, it looks like they're being wound down at a speed to make sure that Mr. Mazza maximizes his profit rather than to serve the patients of Ontario. Can the minister answer: How much longer will Mr. Mazza benefit pecuniarily from Ornge?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I can provide this Legislature and the people of this province of Ontario that Dr. Mazza is no longer on the board. He is no longer affiliated with Ornge. Speaker, that has been done; that work has been done.

The new management at Ornge continues with their focus on patient safety, on winding down the for-profits and addressing the financial issues that have been raised in the audit. The work at Ornge is under way; it is moving forward.

The people of this province expect us to do that work, but they also expect us to do other things in the health care system to provide better care. That's why we're strengthening the work of Health Quality Ontario: so we get better value for the money we spend. It's why we're building the continuum of care in the community: so people can get the care they need outside hospitals.

#### NURSES

**Mr. Grant Crack:** My question also is for the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. Today is a great day. Today is the 13th annual Registered Nurses Association of Ontario Day at Queen's Park. Welcome. I know that nurses do such remarkable work, and I'm proud to be part of a government who holds such high value for everything they do.

**Interjection:** They're not hula-hoop workers.

**Mr. Grant Crack:** No.

I also know that this government has taken steps to ensure that there are more nurses in places where they're needed. Minister, could you tell this House how the Ontario government is supporting the excellent work that nurses across this province are doing?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Every year, I look forward to the RNAO Take Your MPP to Work Day. I always learn about the work that nurses do in different parts of our health care system. Today the nurses are here—today is “take your nurse to work” day for me, and I'm sure they're enjoying that today in the Legislature.

I want to take this opportunity to thank Ontario's nurses. Ontario's nurses are the best nurses in the world.

They are providing excellent care in this province, but their influence also goes beyond the borders of this province. In the mid-1990s, 10,000 nurses left Ontario to work elsewhere. We now have 14,000 more nurses working in this province than when we took office, because we value nurses, we value the work they do, and we want them to do even more.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for a supplementary.

**Mr. Grant Crack:** Thank you, Minister; thank you, Speaker; and also, thank you to the nurses who are here today for all the hard work they do to support our patients across this great province of Ontario.

Minister, I know this government has taken a number of steps to improve access and quality of health care, but there's still much to do. The government's action plan for health care will make sure that patients get the right care at the right time and in the right place.

Speaker, I would like to ask what the government is doing to work with our nurses, going forward, to help achieve these goals and ensure the best possible care for Ontarians.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** We have partnered with the nurses and RNAO on several initiatives, and I'm very happy to share with this House some news that I shared with the nurses this morning. Our government is partnering with the RNAO in funding an initiative called the NQuIRE Initiative. NQuIRE will establish a central database of nursing-sensitive indicators for RNAO's clinical best practice guidelines. These guidelines have been translated into multiple languages and are improving care right around this planet.

This new program, NQuIRE, will play a significant role in understanding the full impact of RNAO's best practice guideline program on quality of care for the people of Ontario.

Speaker, we are very, very proud to work with our nurses. They are very strong partners with us and we welcome the partnership—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mrs. Christine Elliott:** My question is for the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. Minister, on Monday, you said, "the Auditor General—is advocating for a much stronger new performance agreement." Minister, you're clearly referring to something the auditor says in his special report on Ornge, a report that has yet to be tabled. I have a very simple, clear question for the minister: Will she follow the correct parliamentary protocol and table the Auditor General's report so we can get to the bottom of this scandal?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** What I have done is I have spoken to the Auditor General. I have sent the Auditor General a letter. I have asked them to table his report as soon as he deems it ready to be tabled. That is his choice. He will table that report. I've asked him to do it as

quickly as possible because, like all members in this House, I want all of the information related to Ornge available to us so we can continue to make the changes that are necessary there.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mrs. Christine Elliott:** Mr. Speaker, the minister's slip-up on Monday clearly indicates that she has been given drafts of the Auditor General's report. She has been rehearsing all her answers. That's precisely why we need an all-party select committee to get to the answers on Ornge so we can ask the questions and get honest, unrehearsed answers that will allow us to get to the bottom of this scandal.

Will the minister acknowledge the will of the two opposition parties who hold the majority of the seats in this Legislature and agree to set up a select committee?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I will not presume the will of this body. I will let this Legislature do its work and I will support any decision this Legislature makes. We are moving forward on making the changes at Ornge that the people of this province expect us to make. I have met with front-line staff. They are pleased with the progress that they are seeing, but they have lots of ideas about more that needs to be done. We need to get on with making those changes. If the will of the Legislature decides they want to undertake this exercise, of course, I will support that. But my focus is on moving forward.

#### YOUTH SERVICES

**Miss Monique Taylor:** My question is to the Minister of Children and Youth Services. The provincial—  
*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from St. Catharines, withdraw.

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Withdraw.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Come to order, please. Member?

**Miss Monique Taylor:** Thank you. The Provincial Advocate for Children and Youth released a report on the need and economic benefit of modernizing the extended care and maintenance program for the former children in care. The personal stories illustrating this need are heart-wrenching and compelling. More than half of Ontarians aged 20 to 24 still live at home with their parents, yet the youth who face the greatest turmoil are left without any support at the age of 21.

Speaker, we've been calling for a change to ECM for years. Will the minister finally meet the needs of the youth and immediately extend the ECM to 25?

**Hon. Eric Hoskins:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member opposite for raising this important issue. I know she's working hard on it, and it's an issue, as it should be, that's important to her party as well. I want to first thank the Provincial Advocate for Children and Youth for this report and for the hard work that he is doing each day on behalf of vulnerable children and youth in this province. I want to state that our government is, of course, commit-

ted to providing children and youth, particularly those who are receiving support and protection through our children's aid societies, with every opportunity to reach their full potential.

I will review the provincial advocate's report and its recommendations, and I look forward to receiving the final report as well from the Youth Leaving Care hearings that took place last fall and will be presented to the Legislature in the spring.

1120

I welcome the opportunity to continue to work closely with the advocate, as I have done, on issues that are of mutual and important concern.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Miss Monique Taylor:** This morning's report lays out a cost-benefit analysis that we can't afford to ignore. For every dollar that the province spends on caring for a youth on ECM, \$1.36 would be earned over that person's lifetime. This translates into millions of dollars of savings.

Providing these youth with the tools that they need to succeed is simply the right thing to do. This is one small change that can be made today. Will the minister commit to modernizing the ECM?

**Hon. Eric Hoskins:** Again, I'm grateful for receiving the question. Both the advocate and my ministry are committed to helping children and youth to be safe and to reach their full potential.

We know particularly that our crown wards face specific and challenging obstacles as they transition into adult life and into being full members of our societies, and that they require specific supports in order to do that.

Changes that came into effect by this government just last September, for example, allow 16- and 17-year-olds who were formerly crown wards, who have left the care of the children's aid societies and of the province, to actually come back and receive care from the ages of 18 to 21, including extended care and maintenance support and other financial support.

We have also provided the equivalent of the Ontario child benefit, actually, which we make available through the children's aid societies for the support of our crown wards.

So we continue to work hard on this issue. I look forward—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

**Mr. David Zimmer:** My question is for the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services. Minister, there's a whole lot of concern here in Ontario about the federal government's recent introduction of its omnibus crime bill, Bill C-10. In fact, this week, the federal Parliamentary Budget Officer said that the bill is going to have significant financial consequences for all provinces in Canada, including Ontario.

I've heard from lots of residents in Willowdale. They are very concerned about these big costs being downloaded by the federal government with no discussion, no financial support, at a time when Ontario is trying to manage its heavy cost structure.

Minister, what are the financial impacts of Bill C-10? What's it going to cost us? What's it going to cost us to allow the federal government to get away with this unilateral action?

**Hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** I want to thank the member from Willowdale for his very important question.

Ontario supports initiatives to make communities safer and to protect our children and families from crime. The Parliamentary Budget Officer has released a report which says that the federal Bill C-10 will cost the provinces an extra \$137 million per year. We know that this report does not factor in the costs of a new prison, which would be \$900 million to build and \$60 million per year to operate.

Our analysis shows that Bill C-10 may cost Ontario taxpayers more than \$1 billion and may add as many as 1,500 additional inmates to provincial prisons, which may require a new facility to be built.

Ontario families cannot be expected to pay the cost for federal anti-crime initiatives when the federal government won't even discuss—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. David Zimmer:** The facts are, the federal Conservatives are forcing this legislation on Ontarians, who don't have a say in the matter, and then they're forcing Ontario families to foot the bill. That's not fair. That's how federalism should not work.

Minister, what are you going to do to push back and get the federal government to do the right thing, to cover the cost of their own promises? Members of this Legislature want to help you in this pushback, Minister. What can we do, as a member of this party? What can the other parties do to help you push back and get a fair deal for Ontario?

**Hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** At the recent meeting of the federal, provincial and territorial justice ministers in Prince Edward Island, all provinces and territories called on the federal government to enter a discussion. We have received no response from the federal government.

On February 21, I wrote a letter to the Senate telling them Ontario's families cannot afford the \$1 billion as a result of Bill C-10. Ontario supervises more than 50,000 individuals each day. We estimate this would increase by 1,000 under Bill C-10, increasing caseloads for probation and parole officers. Additional inmates to provincial prisons may require a new, costly facility to be built.

Ontario families want the Conservatives and the NDP to stand up to Harper and tell him we cannot afford this bill.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mrs. Jane McKenna:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. On

Friday, February 17, just before the Legislature returned, you were quoted in media saying, "If the Legislature wants to strike committees to look at Ornge, then I will of course co-operate."

The Ontario PC and NDP caucuses have taken you at your word. This morning we came to the table with the terms of reference for an all-party select committee whose sole mandate is to get to the bottom of the problems at Ornge that we all want to fix.

You've had time to consider your answer. Mr. Speaker, will the minister step up to the plate and do the right thing and support an all-party committee for Ornge?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, my viewpoint has not changed in the 10 minutes since I was last asked the very same question. If it is the will of this Legislature that a select committee be struck, I will be supportive of that. I will be supportive of this Legislature exercising its authority to look at whatever it looks at.

So, yes, of course I will support that if indeed it is the will of the Legislature.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary question?

**Mrs. Jane McKenna:** Mr. Speaker, the minister's remarks to media were not the only time she said she would advocate for a select committee if the majority of the House wanted it. A week later, she said in the chamber: "If it is the will of the Legislature that they look at Ornge, I will be nothing but supportive of that decision."

The NDP and PC caucuses have presented you with terms of reference for an all-party committee to get to the bottom of the problems at Ornge. Now is the time for the minister to get back to her word. Minister, again I ask you: Will you support our call for an all-party select committee to be formed to get to the bottom of what needs to be done at Ornge?

*Applause.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Be seated.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order, please. Order, please. Thank you.

Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, my opinion has not changed in the one minute since I answered the last question, and that is, if it is the will of this Legislature that a select committee be struck, I will be nothing but supportive.

My focus is on moving forward. My focus is on making the changes at Ornge so that it is as strong as it can be, providing the best care and the best value to the people of this province.

## NURSE PRACTITIONERS

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** Ma question est pour la ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée. This morning we are joined by 150 nurses and nursing students. Many of them are in the galleries with us today.

Nurses understand the need for innovation and the need for excellence in primary care. Nurse-practitioner-led clinics have both of those, and much, much more. Yet today, nurse-practitioner-led clinics are unable to work to their full potential because the ministry has failed to properly support this model. What is the ministry's plan for addressing the ongoing structural issues in nurse-practitioner-led clinics so that they can best meet the needs of their communities and the needs of their clients?

1130

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Ontario's nurse-practitioner-led clinics are the envy of the rest of Canada. In fact, other health ministers come to me and ask me, "What are you doing? How can we learn from what you have done?" I am enormously proud of the nurse-practitioner-led clinics that are opening up right across this province, the very first one in Sudbury. We now have another 20 open and more opening that will take us to 26 nurse-practitioner-led clinics.

This is a new model of care, a promising model of care. I can tell you that the patients at nurse-practitioner-led clinics are very supportive of this model of primary care. It's another option for the people of Ontario. We will continue to strengthen the nurse-practitioner-led model of care.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** I would like the minister to answer this question. The minister knows that nurse-practitioner-led clinics need a collaborative physician. Yet so far, she has refused to address the ongoing issue with physicians' collaboration and supporting the interdisciplinary care. These are serious issues, and they impact the ability of nurses to deliver top-quality care. The ministry must make sure that nurse-practitioner-led clinics are structured to be able to work to their full potential.

Will the minister agree to finally address those structural problems so that the model is strengthened, the health of Ontario is improved and the collaboration with physicians is settled?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I can absolutely undertake to work with RNAO and with the Nurse Practitioners' Association of Ontario, as we have done in the past, to continue the work to strengthen this new model of care.

As I say, this is a new model of care in the province. We are still in the process of opening these new nurse-practitioner-led models. But Speaker, from Thunder Bay to the shores of Lake Erie, right across this province, patients are benefiting from the care provided by nurse practitioners.

Will we need to continue to improve that model? Absolutely, Speaker. Are we enthusiastic partners? We sure are.

## WATER QUALITY

**Mrs. Teresa Piruzza:** My question today is for the Minister of the Environment. My question is with respect

to water, which we all know is fundamental to life and to health for all our communities.

In Ontario, we have the privilege of being co-stewards of the largest supply of fresh water in the world: the Great Lakes and their tributary rivers. Being from Windsor, I'm very familiar with that waterfront, as I drive by it every day when I'm home. Protecting this resource has been a key priority of this government for the past eight years.

Speaker, through you, would the Minister of the Environment share with the House what steps our government has taken to protect our drinking water and preserve our Great Lakes?

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** You will know that in the throne speech, it was indicated that the government wishes to pass a Great Lakes protection act if the Legislature deems that appropriate. I have actually contacted the critics from the Progressive Conservative Party and the NDP to ask them to submit any ideas they might have—or other members of the Legislature—in this regard.

Even though there has been some considerable progress made in terms of the environmental condition of the Great Lakes, there are still some challenges that are there like invasive species; for instance, the blue algae that we see.

At the recent meeting of the rural municipalities of Ontario, many of them talked about the work that they are doing at the present time with their source protection committees. I want to commend them, and I want to commend all of the organizations that have been involved in this, bringing forward the recommendations which we wish to see implemented—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mrs. Teresa Piruzza:** Thank you, Speaker. Again, my interest is for the Minister of the Environment. I'd like to thank the minister for providing the House with an update on all the hard work this government has done to protect our Great Lakes. I know that there's a lot of great research and good work being done in our communities through our universities and through the University of Windsor as well. I know my constituents, along with the rest of Ontario, will be pleased to hear these results.

Access to safe drinking water plays an important role in our quality of life. Communities need to be aware of any and all potential risks to local water supplies. According to Justice Dennis O'Connor's findings in the 2002 Walkerton report, "The first barrier to the contamination of drinking water involves protecting the sources of drinking water." Minister, would you be able to elaborate on what our government is doing to protect our drinking water sources so that Ontarians can continue having access to clean drinking water?

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Well, I can tell the member that we allocated some \$653 million to waste water infrastructure upgrades in the Great Lakes basin since March 2007. I think that's a very appropriate investment.

But people in the environmental community and people in the various organizations that are involved with municipalities will tell us that source protection is exceedingly important. That's why I'm so pleased that members of the farming community, individual municipalities, environmental groups and those involved with natural resources have gotten together to try to identify the problems that are there and the best possible solutions to them. They have come to me and said that there has been considerable progress made. What we have to do now is implement each and every one of the recommendations which is practical. That way, we can protect the water sources that go into the Great Lakes and, indeed, water sources across Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. There being no deferred votes today, this House stands recessed until 1 p.m. this afternoon.

*The House recessed from 1137 to 1300.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Mr. John O'Toole:** Welcome, this afternoon, to everyone. I'm very pleased to introduce constituents of mine whom I've just met with, who will be here shortly: Ola Aderinboye—"ola" means hello, of course—Roshani Fiorito, Marianne Cochrane, Ines Jowlett and Cynthia Harris, members of the RNAO of Ontario. I'm very proud that they are my constituents and very proud to meet with and represent them.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Introduction of guests—even if they're not here.

**Ms. Tracy MacCharles:** There is a great group of kids here from Glengrove Public School, grade 5, from my riding of Pickering-Scarborough East. They're from the Scarborough side. They're very enthusiastic to be here. They're just taking their coats off and getting settled. I'd love to be able to acknowledge them later, if that's possible, Speaker.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. We welcome the guests who are going to be in the gallery shortly. Introduction of guests?

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** I've got people coming next week.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Go right ahead, my friend.

Members' statements.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### VALLEYS 2000

**Mr. John O'Toole:** In a few moments, I'll be reading my statement.

This Friday—that's tomorrow—it's my privilege to join Bowmanville and area residents in support of the Valleys 2000 fundraising gala. The gala has been launched as a new initiative called A River Runs Through Us. Our keynote speaker of the evening will be

General Rick Hillier, former chief of defence staff and an avid sports fisherman.

Valleys 2000 is dedicated to the restoration and stewardship of two important river systems in Bowmanville: the Soper Creek Valley and the Bowmanville Creek Valley. Before the settlement of the community of Bowmanville, the creeks wove their way through the heart of the area; in fact, there were mills there.

This project will enhance the Bowmanville Creek Valley with a new fish bypass channel, viewing platform and a bridge. This will preserve fish population and habitat, as well as educating future generations.

I want to extend my sincere thanks and congratulations to the Valleys 2000 project team and funding committee as well: Reverend Frank Lockhart has been a tireless worker, voluntarily rehabilitating the valley himself; Bill Huether, Jack and Jackie Hampsey, Gail Rickard, Kevin Anyan and Ron Robinson. I'd like to thank Al Strike and others.

I'd also like to recognize the youth who are involved—Steve and Tory Kat, Amy Logan Holmes, my son Erin O'Toole—and the volunteers, a hard-working group that's put this gala together.

I'm proud of the project, and I support it myself.

#### RIDING OF LONDON-FANSHAWE

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** I'm also pleased to be able to share with the members of this Legislature the excellent work organized by the dedicated and community-focused people in my riding of London-Fanshawe.

As you know, this past February 20, people across the province celebrated Family Day. In a riding with 9.5% unemployment and the devastating incident with Caterpillar still lingering, one could only imagine there is little inspiration to be found or little to celebrate. However, that is not the case here. The people of London-Fanshawe have shown constant courage and tenacity to move our community forward.

This past Family Day, many dedicated volunteers organized the first Argyle Amazing Race and Winter Festival. This inaugural community celebration, led by the Child and Youth Network and the local BIA, was a fun, exciting opportunity to bring families together. It also serves to remind us what an amazing place we live, work and play in, that we all share.

In particular, I want to recognize Tosha Densky from the Child and Youth Network for her passion and perseverance. Tosha, on behalf of the constituents of London-Fanshawe, we thank you for your commitment to our community. This event coordinated local residents, business members and community leaders to offer a fun-filled race that took participants to four different neighbourhood locations throughout London-Fanshawe.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on about the generosity and the great things my constituents are doing, but today I want to say thank you to them for their compassion and care for each other.

#### PETER ADAMS

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an individual from our riding who recently was honoured with the Order of Ontario.

Dr. Peter Adams has, during his lifetime, worn many hats. He was an esteemed member of this place, the Ontario Legislature, from 1987 to 1990. He then went on to serve as the federal member of Parliament in the House of Commons in Ottawa from 1993 until his retirement in 2006.

These are only a few of his accomplishments. Prior to his political career, he was the director of the subarctic research laboratory in Schefferville, Quebec. He then moved on to Trent University in my riding, where he taught as a professor of geography and was the coordinator of northern studies. He was vice-president academic during his tenure and currently today is a professor emeritus in the field of geography.

Peter's knowledge of ice is recognized at the global level. Peter has written too many books and articles to list. He co-edited a local history named Peterborough and the Kawarthas, a book that I've given to many visitors to my riding of Peterborough. In 1981 he was named Peterborough's citizen of the year.

Mr. Speaker, Peter Adams is my friend and mentor. We've spent many hours together discussing politics, past and present. It was a proud day for Peter, Jill, his family and friends and our community when he was honoured with the Order of Ontario, an honour that was very richly deserved.

#### RAIL ACCIDENT

**Mrs. Jane McKenna:** Last Sunday, Via Rail train 92, carrying 75 passengers from Niagara Falls to Toronto, derailed in Burlington. Three crew members, including two experienced engineers, were killed and a dozen passengers were injured.

Our thoughts and condolences go to the families of Ken Simmonds and Peter Snarr, both from Toronto, and Patrick Robinson of Cornwall, Ontario. Both Mr. Simmonds and Mr. Snarr had more than 30 years of service as locomotive engineers. Mr. Robinson was a new Via employee who was on board as an observer as part of his familiarization program.

I would like to extend my heartfelt thanks to Burlington Fire Chief Shayne Mintz and the entire Halton emergency medical service team, which worked tirelessly and professionally to ensure that the rescue operation was orderly, calm and effective.

On behalf of the people of Ontario, I also want to recognize the work of the Burlington police and Joseph Brant Memorial Hospital, where several of the passengers were treated. The people of Burlington rely on their dedication and commitment to excellence 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Last weekend's tragic event gave us all a reason to express our gratitude for the important work that they do.

## FIRE SAFETY

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Mr. Speaker, again I rise in the House in order to call on the government to get the coroner to do a coroner's inquest in regard to the fire that took the life of Rose Levesque, an 88-year-old resident in our community at Rainbow Suites. I had asked this question earlier to the minister responsible, Madame Meilleur. She has since given me a response, which I accept at its face value because it was only part of what should be, in my view—the investigation. This was the fire marshal's office investigation, that essentially said that there were a number of things that needed to be done by the city of Timmins and the fire prevention services in order to try to ensure that these types of tragedies don't happen again.

I am sure that the fire marshal's office will be working with the city of Timmins in order to get them to do what needs to be done, but the question still needs to be put. This is just scratching the surface. The fire marshal's office, yes, did an investigation, but I think that the family and others who were involved in that fire need the opportunity to stand before a coroner's inquest to be able to talk about what it is to them that they want to insert in this particular discussion.

1310

Coroner's office inquests are very different than what a fire marshal does in scope, by which the coroner is able to make recommendations that are far more sweeping and sometimes far more binding than what a fire marshal is able to do when it comes to their investigation.

We thank the fire marshal for the investigation—we thank the minister for doing that—but when we want is a coroner's inquest so that, in the end, the people of the city of Timmins and the family of Madame Levesque and the fire services and others can present to that coroner's inquest so that we can get to the bottom of this and never have it happen again.

## GOVERNMENT'S RECORD

**Mr. Mike Colle:** I want to make a statement about choices.

Difficult times call for difficult choices. With the recent recession and with the continuing global economic downturn, Ontarians have faced challenges together. Throughout this, our government has led thoughtfully. Our choices are putting hundreds of thousands of Ontario men and women to work. Provincial gross domestic product has grown 5.8% since the depth of the recession, and our economy is bigger now than it was when the recession hit. Some 121,000 jobs were created in our province in 2011. That's almost half the jobs created in all of Canada. We will continue to make difficult choices to protect services and build a better economy.

On the other hand, the Conservatives are taking a different route. They railed against tax reform, which is creating jobs. They call our support for the auto workers—they called that corporate welfare, the Conserva-

tives did. Yet, we've created those jobs at General Motors and Chrysler. Sadly, they oppose investments in clean energy jobs—more jobs they oppose. Most recently, they voted against the healthy homes renovation tax, where they voted against jobs and against seniors who want to stay in their homes. How could they do that, Mr. Speaker? I ask you: How can they do that?

## PREMIER'S COMMENTS

**Mr. Ted Arnott:** I rise this afternoon as our party's critic to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs to point out the folly of the Premier's regrettable statements this week, which have strained our relations with the province of Alberta and indeed all of western Canada.

According to published reports, the Premier suggested that our Canadian currency is a “petro dollar” and that he favours scaling back the development of the oil and gas industry in the west. These comments overlook the fact that there are almost 300 Ontario companies that supply or manufacture equipment to the oil patch. What's more, the Canadian Energy Research Institute projects that the oil sands will generate \$63 billion in economic activity and over 65,000 jobs in Ontario in the coming years.

Premier McGuinty has correctly observed that a Canadian dollar trading at par with the US dollar represents a competitive challenge. But today, Jayson Myers of the Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters indicated that the biggest challenge is the drop in US demand, not a Canadian dollar trading close to par.

Where was the Premier in 2006 when I repeatedly called for committee hearings on the competitiveness of our manufacturing sector with a view to developing strategies to support manufacturing? He was oblivious, even as more than 300,000 manufacturing jobs evaporated.

During his tenure, we've become a have-not province. His excessive spending threatens our credit rating and the prosperity of future generations.

If the Premier is unwilling to provide the kind of leadership we need today, he needs to contemplate his future and he needs to apologize to our fellow Canadians in the west.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order.

Members' statements? Member from Etobicoke North.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Could I have order, please?

## CANCER COLORECTAL

## COLORECTAL CANCER

**M. Shafiq Qaadri:** Comme médecin et aussi un député de l'Assemblée législative, j'ai le plaisir et la responsabilité de parler d'un sujet très important : le cancer du côlon et aussi du rectum.

Speaker, it's an important issue that I raise, both as a physician and a parliamentarian, to mark National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month. In 2011, approximately 8,100 people in the province of Ontario were diagnosed with colorectal cancer, and unfortunately, approximately 3,250 actually succumbed to that illness and died.

We know that it's absolutely critical for people, when it comes to colorectal cancer, to be diagnosed early. As a physician, I can tell you that we have something in the order of a 90% survival chance with early detection and early cure.

That's why, of course, the government of Ontario has created ColonCancerCheck, our screening program that is now in its many years of being rolled out across the province. This program recommends that all Ontarians aged 50 to 74 years be screened for colorectal cancer. Often, there are no symptoms in the early stages, but screening can, of course, detect the colorectal cancer if it's done appropriately.

I rise, Speaker, through you to the people of Ontario and to all members of the assembly, to encourage you to make Ontarians aware of National Colorectal Cancer Month.

#### ACCOUNTABILITY

**Mr. Rod Jackson:** As the critic for accountability, along with my colleague the member from Durham here, I'd like to remind the government and Premier McGuinty what accountability truly means. It's quite a simple concept that this government has found quite hard to understand. Accountability is the acknowledgement and the assumption of responsibility for actions.

We've seen little of this from this government. The fact is that rather than accept responsibility, this government has chosen to blame those around them.

The scandal at Ornge? Blame the public servants.

No disclosure of the Pan Am budget? Blame the federal government. Blame everybody else around: the secretariat, or the number of other organizations that are involved with Pan Am.

Failing economy? Blame Europe and Greece; never mind that we came out on the bottom of that in our country. We're on an equal footing with every other province in our country, yet we still came out at the bottom of that global recession.

Failing health care system? Blame Ottawa.

The pattern is simple to see. When presented with the consequence of his actions, the Premier has skirted his responsibility. He has chosen to ignore responsibility and ignore his duty to the people of Ontario and be accountable.

Our great province deserves more, a more accountable government. Our people deserve better than Dalton McGuinty and the Liberal government that has given us zero accountability and has not stood up for the people of Ontario as they have been elected to do.

#### VISITORS

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I'm not sure what school they're from, but I just noticed a number of our youngest citizens coming into the visitors' west gallery. We just want to give them a warm welcome this afternoon. I think it would be appropriate—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member knows that that's not a point of order.

#### CORRECTION OF RECORD

**Mr. John O'Toole:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I'd like to correct my record from my statement this morning. I should have mentioned—I hope I mentioned correctly—the names Al Strike and Harold Hammond, who are the chairs of the Valleys 2000 gala tomorrow evening.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** As the members know, to correct your record is a point of order. Thank you for your point of order.

#### VISITORS

**Ms. Tracy MacCharles:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: Thank you to my colleague the member from Peterborough for recognizing the kids here. I'd love to introduce to you all the children from Glengrove Public School, grade 5, in Pickering, from my riding of Pickering—Scarborough East.

We got to meet downstairs and have a photo, and seeing the folks from Glengrove reminds me, and I'm sure all of you, why we're all here. The kids are our future—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. I will remind the member that that is not a point of order, but we welcome your guests.

Time has been set aside for introductions, and we would hope that everyone would do that as best as they possibly can. Thank you very much.

It is now time for petitions.

#### PETITIONS

#### WIND TURBINES

**Mr. John O'Toole:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your patience while I get these petitions out. It's appreciated.

This one reads as follows:

"Whereas industrial wind turbine developments have raised concerns among" Ontario citizens from one part of the province to another "over health, safety and property values"—the list goes on;

"Whereas the Green Energy Act allows wind turbine developments to bypass" local "meaningful public input and municipal approvals;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Minister of the Environment"—Mr. Bradley—"revise the Green Energy Act to allow full public input and municipal approvals on all industrial wind farm developments and that a moratorium on wind" farm "development be declared" immediately "until an independent, epidemiological study is completed into the health and environmental impacts of industrial wind turbines" on the people of Ontario.

This is a public safety issue, and I'm pleased to sign and support it and give it to William, one of the new pages.

1320

#### KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Today I'm very pleased to have a petition from Heather Holland, who lives at RR 3 Lakeview at 1754 Westview Point Road. I know that area extremely well. It's a great part right on the lake, Stoney Lake, I believe. It says:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, Canada, draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to the following:

"Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada;

"Whereas real progress has been made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease, in particular the development of a bioartificial kidney;

"We, the undersigned, call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make research funding available for the explicit purpose of conducting bioartificial kidney research as an extension to the research being successfully conducted at several centres in the United States" of America.

I agree with this petition and will give it to page Marium.

#### WIND TURBINES

**Mr. Jim McDonell:** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, and I would like to read it. It says:

"Whereas industrial wind turbine developments have raised concerns among citizens over health, safety and property values; and

"Whereas the Green Energy Act allows wind turbine developments to bypass meaningful public input and municipal approval;

"Therefore, we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ministry of the Environment revise the Green Energy Act to allow full public input and municipal approvals on all industrial wind farm developments; and

"That the Minister of the Environment conduct a thorough scientific study on the health and environmental impacts of industrial wind turbines."

I agree with this petition, and I will be signing it.

#### DOG OWNERSHIP

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** This petition is to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and reads as follows:

"Whereas currently the law takes the onus off of owners that raise violent dogs by making it appear that violence is a matter of genetics; and

"Whereas the Dog Owners' Liability Act does not clearly define a pit bull, nor is it enforced equally across the province, as pit bulls are not an acknowledged breed;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Legislative Assembly pass Bill 16, the Public Safety Related to Dogs Statute Law Amendment Act, 2011, into law."

I couldn't agree more. I recommend Thomas Walkom's article. I will sign this and give it to Mackenzie to deliver it to the table.

#### KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I have another petition today. This one is from Bernice Jacobs, who lives at 184 Clifford Road in Warsaw, Ontario, which is in the municipality of Douro-Dummer. She was very kind to deliver this petition to me.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Well, I am.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, Canada, draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to the following:

"Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada;

"Whereas real progress has been made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease, in particular the development of a bioartificial kidney;

"We, the undersigned, call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make research funding available for the explicit purpose of conducting bioartificial kidney research as an extension to the research being successfully conducted at several centres in the United States" of America.

I agree with this petition and will affix my signature to it and give it to page Samantha.

#### RURAL SCHOOLS

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** "Petition to Save Duntroon Central Public School and All Other Rural Schools in Clearview Township.

"Whereas Duntroon Central Public School is an important part of Clearview township and the surrounding area; and

"Whereas Duntroon Central Public School is widely recognized for its high educational standards and intimate learning experience; and

"Whereas the frameworks of rural schools are different from urban schools and therefore deserve to be governed by a separate rural school policy; and

"Whereas Dalton McGuinty promised during the 2007 election that he would keep rural schools open when he declared that, 'Rural schools help keep communities strong, which is why we're not only committed to keeping them open—but strengthening them'; and

"Whereas Dalton McGuinty found \$12 million to keep school swimming pools open in Toronto but hasn't found any money to keep rural schools open in Simcoe-Grey;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That Premier Dalton McGuinty and the Minister of Education support the citizens of Clearview township and suspend the Simcoe County District School Board ARC 2010:01 until the province" of Ontario "develops a rural school policy that recognizes the value of schools in the rural communities of Ontario."

I agree with this petition and I will sign it. Thank you.

#### RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr. Rod Jackson:** I have a petition here to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas Solray Energy Corp. has given notice of its proposal for a class 3 solar power facility known as Epsom Solar Farm to be located in the township of Scugog; and

"Whereas the site is on prime farmland that has been in production for many generations; and

"Whereas we consider productive farmland to be of vital importance to farm and rural communities by providing healthy, locally grown food and ensuring the sustainability of Canada's food supply; and

"Whereas class 1 to 5 farmland and land that is zoned rural or agricultural should be protected from the current proposal and similar projects that may be considered in the future; and

"Whereas other sites of less value to agriculture are better locations for solar power developments;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature not to allow large, industrial solar farms on prime agricultural land, and we further express our support for giving local communities, through their elected municipal councils, the power to control and approve large-scale renewable energy developments."

I agree with this petition, Mr. Speaker. I affix my name and I will give it to page Grace Zhou to bring down to the table.

#### KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I have another petition. This one is submitted, actually, by the cousin of the member from Durham, Brian O'Toole, who lives at 950 Valleyview Drive in Peterborough, Ontario. He always speaks highly of his cousin John on many occasions.

"Petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, Canada, draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to the following:

"Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada;

"Whereas real progress is being made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease, in particular the development of a bioartificial kidney;

"We, the undersigned, call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make research funding available for the explicit purpose of conducting bioartificial kidney research as an extension to the research being successfully conducted at several centres in the United States" of America.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with this petition, will affix my signature to it and give it to page Kriti.

#### RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** I have a petition here.

"Whereas Solray Energy Corp. has given notice of its proposal for a class 3 solar power facility known as Epsom Solar Farm to be located in the township of Scugog; and

"Whereas the site is on prime farmland that has been in production for many generations; and

"Whereas we consider productive farmland to be of vital importance to farm and rural communities by providing healthy, locally grown food and ensuring the sustainability of Canada's food supply; and

"Whereas class 1 to 5 farmland and land that is zoned rural or agricultural should be protected from the current proposal and similar projects that may be considered in the future; and

"Whereas other sites of less value to agriculture are better locations for solar power developments;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature not to allow large, industrial solar farms on prime agricultural land, and we further express our support for giving local communities, through their elected municipal councils, the power to control and approve large-scale renewable energy developments."

I agree to this petition, I affix my signature to it and give it to page Jason to take down.

#### RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr. John O'Toole:** I'm pleased to also present a petition on behalf of my constituents in the riding of Durham. It reads as follows:

"Whereas Solray Energy Corp. has given notice of its proposal for a class 3 solar power facility known as Epsom Solar Farm to be located in the township of Scugog; and

"Whereas the site is on prime farmland that has been in production for many generations; and

"Whereas we consider productive farmland to be of vital importance to farm and rural communities"—in fact, people of Ontario—"by providing healthy, locally

grown food and ensuring the sustainability of Canada's food supply; and  
1330

"Whereas class 1 to 5 farmland and land that is zoned agricultural or rural" must "be protected from the current proposal and similar projects that may be considered in the future" and continuing into the future; "and

"Whereas other sites of less value to agriculture are a better location" and better sites "for solar power developments;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature not to allow large, industrial solar farms on prime" class 1 "agricultural land, and we further express our support for giving local communities, through their" locally "elected municipal councils, the power to control and approve large-scale renewable energy developments."

I'm pleased to sign in support of this for my constituents and give it to one of the pages, Katelyn.

### DIAGNOSTIC SERVICES

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** I have this petition from the people of northeastern Ontario, and it reads as follows:

"Whereas the Ontario government is making ... PET scanning, a publicly insured health service available to cancer and cardiac patients...; and

"Whereas" since "October 2009, insured PET scans" are available and "performed in Ottawa, London, Toronto, Hamilton and Thunder Bay; and

"Whereas the city of Greater Sudbury is a hub for health care in northeastern Ontario, with" Health Sciences North, "its regional cancer program and the Northern Ontario School of Medicine;"

They "petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make PET scans available through" Health Sciences North, "thereby serving and providing equitable access to the citizens of northeastern Ontario."

I fully support this petition, Mr. Speaker, will affix my name to it and ask our page Ryan to bring it to the Clerk, while he's waving at the camera.

### KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I have another petition from an O'Toole in Peterborough riding today. This one is from Sandra O'Toole, from 1809 Crowley Line of Peterborough, Ontario. She gave me this petition to read. It says:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, Canada, draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to the following:

"Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada;

"Whereas real progress is being made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease, in particular the development of a bioartificial kidney;

"We, the undersigned, call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make research funding available for the explicit purpose of conducting bioartificial kidney research as an extension to the research being successfully conducted at several centres in the United States."

Mr. Speaker, I agree with this petition, will affix my signature to it and give it to page Shirley.

### RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** A petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Solray Energy Corp. has given notice of its proposal for a class 3 solar power facility known as Epsom Solar Farm to be located in the township of Scugog; and

"Whereas the site is on prime farmland that has been in production for many generations; and

"Whereas we consider productive farmland to be of vital importance to farm and rural communities by providing healthy, locally grown food and ensuring the sustainability of Canada's food supply; and

"Whereas class 1 to 5 farmland and land that is zoned rural or agricultural should be protected from the current proposal and similar projects that may be considered in the future; and

"Whereas other sites of less value to agriculture are a better location for solar power developments;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature not to allow large, industrial solar farms on prime agricultural land, and we further express our support for giving local communities, through their elected municipal councils, the power to control and approve large-scale renewable energy developments."

Mr. Speaker, I agree to this petition and affix my signature to it, and I will give it to Grace to take down to the table.

### CORRECTION OF RECORD

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: Earlier today when I introduced one of my petitions, I said "Stoney Lake." I should have said "Buckhorn Lake." They run into each other. I wanted to make sure that I got the geography absolutely precise with this petition.

And I want to acknowledge that Mike Colle had a birthday on February 1. I know we're a month late but, Mike, happy birthday.

### MEMBER FOR OTTAWA CENTRE

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I think it would be disorderly not to recognize the fact that our friend from Ottawa Centre was recently married to Christine, and I would like to congratulate him and thank him for the extraordinary efforts he's made to advance marriage for all Ontarians. Thank you.

## VISITORS

**Mr. Mike Colle:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I know that the member from Durham would like to know that we have a very special school here from my riding. Bais Bracha elementary school is here with their teacher. I would like to welcome them to the Legislature and say, shalom and welcome to Queen's Park.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member knows that's not a point of order, but we'll carry on with business.

## COMMITTEE WITNESSES

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member for Willowdale has given notice of his intention to raise a point of privilege concerning statements he claims were made by the members for Newmarket-Aurora and Nickel Belt at a press conference in the Legislature's media studio earlier today.

I'm prepared to rule on the point of privilege without hearing further from the member for Willowdale, as standing order 21(d) permits me to do.

The member alleges that certain statements made during the press conference could serve to raise doubt and uncertainty in the minds of potential witnesses before legislative committees, resulting in a possible unwillingness of witnesses to offer their testimony and thereby undermining the full effectiveness of our committee system.

While there may exist a difference of opinion between him and other members about the nature and extent of protections available to witnesses of parliamentary committees, I cannot find a head of privilege that has been offended. The member's disagreement with the statement of certain other members does not rise to the level of a *prima facie* case of privilege or contempt.

What the member raised is, in fact, a good subject of debate which, coincidentally, is set down for a segment of this afternoon's consideration of private members' public business. I suggest that it will be a better and appropriate forum for the member for Willowdale to make his case to the House at that time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS'  
PUBLIC BUSINESS

## COMMITTEE WITNESSES

**Ms. Sylvia Jones:** I move that, in the opinion of this House, the Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly should, as part of the Standing Orders study, consider the necessity of amendments to the Standing Orders or Legislative Assembly Act that would extend the protections, immunities, rights and remedies of witnesses and participants in public inquiries to witnesses and participants in committee hearings, including any witness or participant subject to a confidentiality agree-

ment who has information that is in the public interest for the committee to receive.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Ms. Jones has moved private members' notice of motion number 11. Pursuant to standing order 98, the member has 12 minutes for her presentation.

**Ms. Sylvia Jones:** Thank you, Speaker. It was a wordy resolution, but it's an important issue. I rise today to debate an important motion and an issue that I feel very strongly about, and one that has come to the fore because of the recent actions at Ornge, and before that, eHealth, and before that, the OLG. That is, of course, the need to protect whistle-blowers.

My motion is designed to ensure that when people do the right thing and come forward with information that is in the public interest, this House does the right thing and guarantees their protection from future persecution.

I wanted to bring forward this motion today because of the many issues that it seems have been happening almost daily and that continue to happen at Ornge, including, I might add, \$25 million that is still unaccounted for.

Speaker, it takes guts to come forward and voice concerns about superiors' misdeeds. It takes guts to do what is right, even when you're told you could suffer greatly by doing so. When scandalous activity occurs, those who are party to it will always attempt to silence those who witness it. It falls on this House to ensure that those who do the right thing are protected.

Under the excellent leadership of our colleague from Newmarket-Aurora, we have been raising question after question about the issues that are happening at Ornge. Speaker, many of the terrible stories of wasted money and wasted resources have come from former employees who left in disgust when there were concerns raised and they were ignored by management at Ornge and the Ministry of Health.

1340

It is the responsibility of every member here to stand up for the brave whistle-blowers and ensure that the House is on the side of truth, not convenience. This is especially true when it comes to public service. Every employee must feel free to stand up and voice their concerns without fear of repercussion or punishment, particularly when there's a scandal that significantly warrants the full attention of the public. Indeed, I think the questions in this chamber over the last number of weeks prove the importance of this matter.

The situation at the province's air ambulance service, Ornge, has deteriorated tremendously. To say that the agency is mired in scandal would be an understatement. Speaker, the agency has become the epitome of scandal and incompetence, and this is in spite of the exceptional pilots, excellent nurses and all of the other dedicated front-line employees at the agency.

We've all heard about the dubious web of for-profit entities created by the former president of Ornge. We've all heard about the alleged financial impropriety of such enterprises. We've all heard of the unprofessional and

inappropriate way the agency was run by its senior leaders. And worst of all, we all know about the serious and frankly tragic patient safety issues at Ornge.

Questions have been raised in this chamber every single day since the House resumed sitting, as it should be, yet it seems that every day, fewer and fewer questions are being answered by the government. Speaker, both parties in opposition have diligently questioned the minister on Ornge, and both parties have received virtually the same non-answer to every question. Therefore, it stands to reason that there are only two possible explanations for this continued course on the part of the minister. Either she is utterly out of her depth and is therefore unable to answer any of the perfectly clear questions posed by the opposition benches, or the minister is intentionally avoiding answering the questions. Whichever it is, I suppose only the minister knows. However, I do know that the answers provided by the minister on this issue are simply insufficient. They do not satisfy the Ontario taxpayers whose money was carelessly jeopardized. They do not satisfy the front-line workers at Ornge, who were left at the mercy of incompetent management for far too many years. And they most definitely do not satisfy the people whose well-being and, in some cases, lives depended on the air ambulance service.

Speaker, while it remains unclear if the minister really understands the gravity of this situation, what is clear is the need for answers surrounding Ornge. This is why, earlier today, the NDP health critic and the PC member for Newmarket–Aurora called for a select committee to be formed to investigate the Ornge fiasco and get the truth for the people of Ontario.

Former House of Commons Speaker Peter Milliken's Afghan papers ruling demonstrated that parliamentary privilege is an important convention in holding the executive to account. A select committee would review the history and operations at Ornge and report back to the Legislature with recommendations, thus upholding this standard.

Speaker, my experience at the Select Committee on Mental Health and Addictions showed me how effective select committees can be in analyzing complex issues and bringing forward recommendations. Committees have the ability to drill down and get to the bottom of a problem and come up with solutions. More importantly, a committee would provide a forum for people to voice their concerns and raise awareness about the troubling happenings at Ornge.

Speaker, I want to, for the record, submit that I personally do not believe the minister willingly authorized the disgraceful misconduct at Ornge. I do, however, believe that as minister she must be held accountable for the actions at Ornge and lack of oversight provided by her ministry.

It has now become painfully obvious to every member in the House and every resident of this province that such misconduct did occur, and we, members of the Legis-

lature, have a responsibility to provide Ontarians with answers.

I believe that a select committee is the best way to ensure that the full extent of misconduct at Ornge is both determined and documented. I believe that for the select committee to do their job, witnesses will want assurances that the information they share with the members of the committee will not put them in jeopardy. My motion would give witnesses the comfort they need to make sure that their doing their civic duty does not mean that Ornge can prosecute them.

It is very important that the witnesses who testify to the committee have their livelihoods protected. Indeed, it pains me to say that their very freedom needs protection as well, because as recently as last week, the employees at Ornge have been told by the agency's interim boss that they could go to jail if they continue revealing the problems at the agency. Is it coincidence or a bad case of irony that the very people who sounded the alarm at Ornge are now being told to stop talking by the very man the government appointed to fix the agency? I certainly hope that all members would understand the importance of encouraging people to speak out about wrongdoing, not threatening them with jail time.

Given the severity of the recent revelations at Ornge, I think it's safe to make two logical assumptions: first, that if there are more unreported incidents of misconduct at Ornge, they are probably of an equally disturbing severity; second, that due to the severe nature of such instances, there is most likely pressure on those who could inform the public to remain silent. That is why we, as legislators, must move to establish very strict, very strong and very clear protections for witnesses so that we make very certain that those with crucial information have no reason to fear bringing it forward. Moreover, every action must be taken to ensure that every possible misdeed at Ornge is brought to light, fully investigated and ultimately answered for.

A number of the misdeeds at Ornge have been discussed at length, but I feel it is appropriate to cite the following specifically, as they have all been brought to the public's attention by employees or former employees of the service who were brave enough to blow the whistle on this misconduct.

In one instance, an Ornge helicopter was sent to the wrong hospital and, due to a three-hour delay, as a result, the patient had then needed to be transported to the US.

At one point, one helicopter was inbound to Toronto and attempted to establish communication with the helipad but was told to call back because a shift change was taking place. Shame, Speaker. A helicopter—

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I respect the freedom of the member from Dufferin–Caledon to speak about her private members' resolution today—and indeed her resolution sets out a general principle I wish she would address in her remarks, because I think the general principle deserves debate—but I point out to you, Speaker, that pursuant to standing order 23(b), she is not in fact discussing her resolution but is discussing a specific instance.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** I don't believe that's a point of order.

The member from Caledon.

**Ms. Sylvia Jones:** You have to put it in context, so keep listening.

At one point, a helicopter was inbound to Toronto and attempted to establish communication with a helipad but was told to call back because a shift change was taking place. It's shameful, Speaker. A helicopter was sent to a helipad that had a NOTAM—and for non-pilots in the room, a NOTAM is a "note to airman"—saying that the helipad was closed and the lights were out. One helicopter captain requested instructions from the Ornge communications centre, and they replied that they had no idea he had a patient because they had no idea the helicopter was even out of the hangar.

There was one occasion where the crew of an air ambulance and the patient in their care were sent to the totally wrong hospital.

Through it all, the front-line employees at the service continued to try to carry out their duties admirably.

The reason I mention these few occurrences—and there are many more—is because it demonstrates the indispensable value of the whistle-blowers who brought these misdeeds to light. For if the inept management at Ornge had been more successful—and thank goodness they weren't—in their attempts to silence these whistle-blowers, these acts would have almost certainly gone unreported.

You see, one of the many tragedies in this sorry affair is that an agency whose reputation should be defined by the dedicated service of its employees has now instead begun to be defined by the scandalous dealings of its appointed managers. It should come as no surprise then, Speaker, that the very same people who serve at Ornge, day in and day out, are the ones who decided enough was enough. They decided something had to be done. They decided to stand up for the people they serve, the people of Ontario, and voice their concerns with the very serious misdeeds at Ornge.

The employees and former employees at Ornge who have spoken about the gross misconduct need to be protected, and my motion would do that. I would hope that we would have the support of all members of this House to ensure that we can continue.

1350

*Applause.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Thank you. Order. Could I have everybody sitting?

Further debate?

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** I rise in support, along with our caucus, on this particular motion, but I want to not so much set the record straight but make sure that witnesses out there understand: There is some protection when it comes to the ability for witnesses to come forward now. I think what the member is trying to put forward is that we clarify, in some way, our standing orders so there's no ambiguity; so that it's clear and it's transparent and people understand what the rule is.

So let me try to work my way through this in the 12 minutes that I have. What the member is essentially asking is that if a committee was to call a witness, or a person decided on their own volition to come to committee in order to depose whatever their evidence is that they want to give us on any matter, there would be no way that, one, the information that is being supplied to the committee could be used against them in court; and two, that their employer could take reprisals for them having gone and blown the whistle, as they say.

I just want to go through these two things and talk about the current protections that we have under our standing orders and the Legislative Assembly Act and under the precedents, because currently the public does have that right. But I think what the member is trying to get at: We need to clarify it so that in the end, there's no grey area.

First of all, under standing order 21, it says, "Privileges are the rights enjoyed"—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Just let me explain, please.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Order.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** If you want to participate, Minister, you will have a chance.

Under standing order 21, it says, "Privileges are the rights enjoyed by the House collectively and by the members of the House individually conferred by the Legislative Assembly Act and other statutes, or by practice, precedent, usage and custom."

Let's go to the Legislative Assembly Act, because it refers to it. What it says there is:

"Privilege...."

"A member of the assembly is not liable to any civil action or prosecution, arrest, imprisonment or damages, by reason of any matter or thing the member brought by petition, bill, resolution, motion or otherwise, or said before the assembly or a committee thereof," and it gives you the statute.

I think what the member is getting at is that, although this does confer that the witness before the committee has the same privilege and the same protection, it doesn't explicitly say it. I think what the member is trying to get at is: How are we able to make sure that what is a convention is properly reflected in the standing orders and in the Legislative Assembly Act?

Here's the scenario: We know that, under what's happened so far with Ornge, there have been people who have been calling our offices in the opposition—and I've got to believe they're also calling government members as well—in regard to talking about what has happened under Ornge. I don't want to get into the debate of Ornge, but the point is, people are afraid to give their names because they say, "If I say my name is John Smith or Mary Smith and somebody finds out, (a) I'm going to get in trouble with my boss and I might lose my job; and (b) there may be a question that if I put something in writing and give it to you and it's found to be not quite factual, or maybe I've got the facts maybe a little bit wrong, that could be used against me in a civil or criminal action."

I think people—rightfully so—fear that. But I want to say to those people who are watching this particular debate now: Our standing orders, the Legislative Assembly Act and the precedents actually do give you protection. I think what the member is trying to do, and I applaud her for that, is to make it completely transparent, because if I was a member of the public and I was to read what it says in the Legislative Assembly Act—it speaks about members of the assembly. But we understand, and I understand—all of us in this assembly, hopefully—that the rights conferred upon us as members are not just about us as members; it's about the assembly; it's about Parliament. It's in order to give Parliament the ability to do its job.

How could we, as members of a committee, being able to call the public to the bar, as we have the right to do here in the assembly, be able to do our jobs if we couldn't call the public to give testimony at committee, and worry that the person says something, he can be taken to court, and there would be some action taken against him? It would be impossible for a committee structure to function. That's why the British parliamentary system, over the years, adopted rules and adopted precedent that essentially says the rights conferred on members are the rights also conferred on Parliament, meaning to say that if a person comes and gives testimony in one of our committee structures or at the bar of the Legislature, they are also able to enjoy the same privilege that we have.

But what the member, I think, is saying is that we need to make that clearer because if you're the whistleblower wherever in Ontario, if you want to pick up the phone and blow the whistle on wrongdoing or you want to come to a committee to give testimony, people only believe what they see in black and white. They don't quite understand the nuances of law. If they read the law and it says "members," well, it tends to indicate that the public may be omitted.

I think it's a very fair point the member makes in being able to clarify that the rights enjoyed by the members of the assembly are also the rights enjoyed by the general public.

I want to go on to great reading that all members should do. They should all get the latest edition, 2009, of the House of Commons Procedure and Practice, some of the best bedtime reading you can get if you want to fall asleep. I assure you that reading a couple pages of this will do a very good job if you're an insomniac, which I am. So here we go. Page 93 of the precedent reads as follows:

"Importance of freedom of speech.

"Freedom of speech permits members to speak freely in the chamber during a sitting or in committees during meetings while enjoying complete immunity from prosecution or civil liability for any comment they might make."

This is the point. The public wants to know that they have the same. They want to know that, when they come to our committees, that particular privilege that's given to

the assembly or Parliament, as it's also referred to federally, they are able to enjoy the same privilege. My understanding is they do, but if I read that, it talks about members, and again we need to clarify so that people understand that this also applies to the public.

It goes on to say: "This freedom is essential for the effective working of the House. Under it, members are able to make statements or allegations about outside bodies or persons"—right? We can talk about various individuals out there—"which they may hesitate to make without the protection of privilege." We as members enjoy that right. You can stand in the House and say, "I understand that so-and-so profited from such-and-such a thing." If I went outside the House and said that, then I'm open to prosecution, depending on if the person wants to take on a court case. But if I say that in the House or I say it in committee, I am, as a member, protected from being prosecuted and sued as a result of what I've said in the chamber or within the precinct of the assembly.

It goes on to say, "Though this is often criticized, the freedom to make allegations which the member genuinely believes at the time to be true"—and this is the case in the case of Ornge. We're not making this stuff up. I'm sure if the government was in opposition and it was the NDP or the Conservatives in government, they would be making the same allegations. I've been in this House long enough to know that is the case. But it goes on to say, "or at least worthy of investigation, is fundamental." So they're saying it is a fundamental right of Parliament for members to be able to stand to hold a government to task and ask those questions.

What the member is saying is that the public should have the same right or understand that it has the same right if they appear before a committee. If an employee of Ornge happens to come before the select committee that we're proposing, that person in the public would know that if they sit at committee, and they give evidence, they're not going to be prosecuted by a lawyer and that, in the end, they're not going to be fired by the employer.

"The House of Commons could not work effectively unless its members were able to speak and criticize without having to account to any outside body. There would be no freedom of speech"—and that's important—"There would be no freedom of speech if everything had to be proven true before it was uttered."

So yes, the public has to have the same rights. The public has to have the right to say, "Here's what I know. Here's what I saw. Here's what I heard," to come to a committee and put it before us. It may be, as we say, the gospel truth. It may be close to the truth. Who knows? But it'll be up to the committee to decide, based on the evidence, how much of that evidence we can take as fact and how to act upon it when it comes to a decision in the committee.

1400

It goes on to say, "There would be no freedom of speech if everything had to be proven true before it were uttered. In ruling on a question of privilege in 1984,

Speaker Bosley affirmed that ‘the privilege of a Member of Parliament when speaking in the House or in a committee is absolute, and that it would be very difficult to find that any statement made under the cloak of parliamentary privilege constituted a violation of that privilege.’

“This right is also extended to individuals who appear before the House”—and this is the point that I make: The public has this already, our precedents, but who out there owns a copy of this book? Who in here owns a copy of this book? I’ve got three. I’ve got one in my home, I’ve got one in my apartment and I’ve got one here. As I told you, I am really, really an insomniac, and I love reading this stuff.

But the point is this: Our standing orders don’t say that. The standing orders and the Legislative Assembly Act speak about members, but it’s clear that the precedent—and I’m saying this for a reason. I don’t want the public to fear, if they appear before a committee now, that they’re going to be prosecuted. You do have that right, but we want to make sure that it’s crystal clear.

Let me read again: “This right is also extended to individuals who appear before the House or its committees in order to encourage truthful and complete disclosure, without fear of reprisal or other adverse actions as a result of their testimony.”

This is what we’re asking for. We want the public to be free to come and hold us accountable and the decisions of their government or this assembly, and they should have the freedom to be able to do so and explicitly understand that they are covered by our rules of parliamentary privilege. But again—

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Well, they are.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** I agree with you, Mr. House Leader of the government. I agree with you. The problem is, it doesn’t explicitly say that in the Legislative Assembly Act nor in the standing orders, but it is conferred and it says that exactly, under precedent.

I think what the member is trying to do is move what’s in precedent and put it as part of the Legislative Assembly Act or the standing orders.

I just want to finish, and I’ve only got a couple of seconds.

It goes on to say, “In 2005, the Federal Court of Appeal ruled that the testimony of parliamentary witnesses fell within the scope of parliamentary privilege because it is necessary for the functioning of Parliament for three reasons: ‘to encourage witnesses to speak openly before the Parliamentary committee,’” and to allow committees to function.

This has also been held up in the courts, so what we’re trying to do here is take what is the practice, and take the practice and put it into our standing orders so that it’s clear to the public.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. David Zimmer:** It’s my privilege to speak to this important matter.

Let me first say, by way of introduction, that when committees are sitting, members have all the protections that we’ve heard about. Citizens and other non-members who appear in front of those committees share and have the same protections that members do. I want to speak about just what those protections are and how they’re effective.

But first, just let me refer to the ballot item and quote from a section of it.

It goes on to say that the ballot wants to “consider the necessity of amendments to the standing orders or Legislative Assembly Act that would extend the protections, immunities, rights, and remedies of witnesses and participants in public inquiries to witnesses....”

The operative word there is to “extend” the rights. But Speaker, those rights already exist. They exist; they’re set out in the standing orders. Then the courts have expanded and commented on just what those rights are.

In addition to the courts expanding on what those rights are and confirming what those rights are, there are a number of distinguished academic parliamentarian and legal writers who have also commented on what those rights mean and how they extend to non-MPPs, or non-MPs, in the federal parliamentary sense.

So let me just walk the House through three or four of the authorities.

The groundwork authority is set out by Joseph Maingot in *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada: Second Edition*. He says this: “... witnesses, petitioners, and others who take part in proceedings of Parliament are protected from”—he lists several things here—“molestation, threats, or legal proceedings on account of what they may have said or done in either House or a committee thereof.”

Let me just parse that for a second. What that tells us is that a witness before a committee has got protection from any fallout from anything that he says in front of the committee. It’s protection from legal proceedings—for instance, libel, slander and that sort of thing—based on anything he said in front of the committee.

But it also goes further and says that that witness has protection from molestation—harassment, if you will—after he or she leaves the committee, and threats of various sorts, for instance, a threat of dismissal: “You’ve been before the committee, and you’ve said things. I’m your boss, and I don’t like what you said. You’re fired.” That’s molestation and threat. It’s broader than just protection from being sued in the courts for something you may have said in the committee. So that’s the underlying principle.

The author then goes on to say: “Under these circumstances, witnesses, counsel and petitioners have ... the same privileges as the member”—things that have gone on before the committee. The important point here—because the member from Timmins—James Bay has implied that the protections are only from legal proceedings that may arise out of something you’ve said—is that it’s much broader than that. It covers the situation that, frankly, an employee might be concerned about: “Well, I’m

not going to get sued, but I'm going to get fired"; "I'm not going to get sued, but I'm going to get harassed at work"; "I'm not going to get sued, but I'm going to get a transfer in my job and I'm going to be sent to some godawful place to work for the next three or four years." That's molestation and threats. So it's a broad protection, not just this narrow legal protection that the member from James Bay said.

That issue eventually came before the courts. The Federal Court of Canada, in a 2007 decision called *George v. the Attorney General of Canada*, talking about the extent of this privilege, if you will, said:

"First, although witnesses before a parliamentary committee are not members of Parliament, they are not strangers to the House either. Rather they are guests who are afforded parliamentary privilege because, as with members, the privilege is necessary to ensure that they are able to speak openly, free from fear that their words will be used against them in subsequent proceedings.

"Second, without the power to protect witnesses, Parliament's investigative function would be seriously compromised, because witnesses would be less forthcoming."

Another textbook that comments on this is Arthur Beauchesne, in his *Rules and Forms of the House of Commons of Canada*. Again, he makes the point: "Every witness attending before the House or any committee thereof may claim the protection of the House in respect" to evidence given."

Another text, Lee, the *Power of Parliamentary Houses* to send for Persons, Papers and Records—there was some issue that had developed about just what the authority or the power of the committee was to compel people and to get documents and records and so on: "It should be remembered that parliamentary privilege protecting witnesses is not a privilege of the witness but of the House, in that evidence given by witnesses forms part of the proceeding of Parliament," and those protections go way back to the English Bill of Rights, 1689.

So the member's motion is really redundant in the sense that what the motion is asking for is already clearly set out in the rules; it's clearly set out in the case law; it's clearly set out in all of the commentary supporting the case law. The key point here is that anybody who appears in front of a committee is protected on two broad fronts: from any formal, technical, legal proceedings that someone may institute against them because of what they said at the committee; and on a more general level, on a more comprehensive level, they're protected from molestation and threats and harassment because of anything they said. That's something broader than just protections from legal suits, but it's intended to protect people from, as I said earlier, threats, harassment, getting fired, getting a different sort of job that you don't like. So those protections are already in there; the motion is redundant.

1410

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Rob Leone:** I want to congratulate the member for Dufferin-Caledon for her motion. I think it's a very

important motion. I'm going to support it wholeheartedly, and I would ask the members of this House to do the same thing.

One of the words that we hear often from that side of the House, Mr. Speaker, is the word "balance." Several months ago, earlier in this session, the NDP proposed a motion to roll back the corporate tax cuts; on the government side, they voted against it. Yesterday, when our Leader of the Opposition proposed a motion to keep the plan for corporate tax cuts, the government decided to vote against that, too. I'm not sure how that strikes anyone as having any semblance of balance. To me, it's more on the verge of teetering on the side of chaos.

We don't know where that side stands, and I think the same thing can apply to what we're talking about in this case. They want to get to the bottom of a scandal at Ornge—right to the bottom—and they know how to dig their holes. We have a \$16-billion deficit. We haven't even uncovered the scope of what's happening at Ornge. So they say that on the one hand, but on the other hand, they're not going to support a motion—potentially not support a motion—that would ask and protect the very people who allow them to get to the bottom of this problem. I find that very strange, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure why they wouldn't support a motion that actually helps them get toward their desired goal.

I kind of have an answer to that question. I know one of the famous Liberal heroes on that side of the House is former Prime Minister Mackenzie King. When asked about why and how successful he was in politics, he told the interested biographer that he never let his left hand know what his right hand was doing, if you believe that, Mr. Speaker. They don't understand what this left hand is doing because they're not understanding what this right hand is doing. Well, that's pretty interesting. It's about either keeping people informed, which is what they say on the one hand, but not allowing us to get that information on the other. It's the key to the Liberals' success. I think I've just uncovered it and I think what happens inevitably is that Ontarians suffer.

The member for Willowdale says that members of the public who appear before committees have an implicit protection when they speak at committees. The member for Dufferin-Caledon's motion is asking for an explicit protection—explicit in the sense that when a member of the public comes before the committee, they are secure and they are protected from any information that they're willing to provide to members of this House in that committee and members in this House.

So my question is, why wouldn't you support that? It's just codifying, in essence, what already exists, according to the member from Willowdale. Frankly, people would be much more open to coming forward if they felt more secure from being punished.

I also want to quote some words from Shaun Young, who did some work on whistle-blowing. He suggests that, "At its root, the act of whistle-blowing is concerned with responsibility and accountability"—and it italicizes those two things—"with ensuring that those charged with

acting on behalf of the best interests of others do so, and that their failure to satisfy effectively that duty will generate negative consequences for them."

He then goes on to quote Fred Alford, who defines a whistle-blower as "anyone who speaks out in the name of the public good within ... [an] organization."

Young continues: "More precisely, 'whistle-blowing' is typically understood to refer to the act of disclosing information about a 'wrongdoing' to someone who can help ensure that the wrongdoing ceases and that its perpetrator is held accountable for his or her action(s)."

Mr. Speaker, that's what members on this side of the House want. They want to hold the perpetrators to account so that we can hold them responsible for what they've done if any wrongdoing does in fact exist.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate? The member from Mississauga—Streetsville.

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** Thank you very much, Speaker. I'm pleased to join this. I want first of all to thank my colleague the member for Willowdale, a very esteemed lawyer in his own right, who I think, more than anyone else, actually spoke to the subject of today's resolution. I also want to acknowledge the contribution of my colleague from Timmins—James Bay, and if he has got three of those books, perhaps we should put in a collection and buy him a television.

A moment ago, my colleague from Cambridge suggested that this motion would make explicit that which is implicit. I would just like to, in response to that, say, how much more explicit do you want?

Let me quote again from Joseph Maingot's *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, Second Edition: "... witnesses, petitioners, and others who take part in proceedings of Parliament are protected from molestation, threats, or legal proceedings on account of what they may have said or done in either House or a committee thereof."

"Under these circumstances, witnesses, counsel and petitioners have much the same privileges as the member because they are both required to attend."

Again, to quote from Arthur Beauchesne's *Rules and Forms of the House of Commons of Canada*: "Every witness attending before the House or any committee thereof may claim the protection of the House in respect of the evidence to be given." If that's not explicit, please, someone, tell me what is.

Now, the member for Dufferin—Caledon, in her resolution, about which she didn't talk a great deal, raises a subject that I think properly belongs before the Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly and a duly constituted motion to review the standing orders. She is of course welcome to raise it here, but in the normal course of the Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly, she could, as has been done in the past, raise it during the process of a standing committee meeting. She has herself served on the Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly and arguably ought to know about it.

The resolution in and of itself is simply incorrect. It really restates the status quo. Indeed, witnesses appearing before all Ontario legislative committees are fully protected against any threats or legal proceedings that might be started on the basis of evidence that they give at a committee. The Canadian Constitution says it and so do centuries of parliamentary precedent and tradition.

We recognize her freedom to bring it up. We also recognize the fact that, as the member from Willowdale said, while she's welcome to bring it up, it is in fact redundant. The members are of course free to support it or oppose it. What the opinion of the House is on a matter that represents the status quo anyway—that represents the way business is done—I'm sure will be instructive to the member but, I put it to her, is unlikely to change much if it serves to reinforce for her, or for anyone else planning to appear before a standing committee, that the evidence or statements you give before a standing committee or a select committee are completely covered by privilege. Then perhaps the member has done a service.

Thank you very much, Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Thank you. The member for Dufferin—Caledon—

**Ms. Sylvia Jones:** We still have time.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** You still have time? Okay, sorry.

Further debate? The member from Northumberland—Quinte West.

**Mr. Rob E. Milligan:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to join in the debate today and speak in favour of the resolution offered by my colleague the member for Dufferin—Caledon.

Maybe the root of the problem is that government has become too big, too complex and too unwieldy, and has general disrespect for taxpayers and their money.

1420

Mr. Speaker, as a highly respected EMS technician in my riding put it just yesterday, "Ornge is only one colour in the rainbow of Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care of waste, mismanagement and abuse of public trust."

I would love to credit this conscientious paramedic by name, but his efforts to promote a safe workplace, due care for patients and respect for the taxpayers' purse have consistently been met by management opposition and harassment. This paramedic is proof, if ever it were needed, of the requirement for whistle-blower protection for anyone with information on waste, inefficiency or flawed decision-making within the broadest possible definition of the public sector and in any forum, including committee hearings here at Queen's Park.

This paramedic has supplied an unbelievably long list of examples of waste and mismanagement within the Ornge air ambulance and land-based ambulance services. Here's just a sample of the specific items he can substantiate: redundant retraining programs that have wasted over \$100 million in the past eight years; the consistent practice of having EMS services buying new vehicles

and, within two years, quietly transferring those vehicles to other county departments and buying another new fleet of essential ambulances; and ambulances that have been subject to unnecessary expenses, such as an ambulance in the riding of the member from Peterborough that was repainted with a mural of the Kawartha Lakes on the rear doors.

But these pale in comparison to many of the other examples he has brought to me. In one inspection of the drugs on board an ambulance, he discovered that virtually every drug had either passed its expiry date or had been exposed to excessively high or low temperatures. What a sobering state of affairs. And I haven't even touched on his comments related to Ornge.

I ask the Premier to do the honourable thing and ask the current Minister of Health to resign in order to permit a thorough, objective investigation of Ornge and other operations within her ministry. The very lives of Ontario citizens depend on rooting out our systemic defects in the management of resources in this essential ministry, and I can only hope that when they put partisanship aside, the Liberals recognize that their responsibilities as MPPs demand the creation of a select committee on health care management to determine, once and for all, how we can collectively make the health care system more efficient and better. The only way we can expect those with detailed knowledge of the system to participate is to promise them complete protection from recriminations and harassment.

People like the paramedic in my riding want to help. They want to be part of the solution. I call on all members of this Legislature to ensure that there are no barriers to finding the truth and rooting out all waste in the health care system.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** I will be quick—to have the member from Durham to speak. I do support the motion from our colleague from Dufferin—Caledon.

The government's handling of the Ornge scandal and the culture of intimidation that has developed shows me how important this motion is to get to the truth. The member from Newmarket—Aurora has already brought to our attention that this new management installed at Ornge by the Minister of Health has told whistle-blowers to stop talking or risk going to jail. Although the new management has recanted, I can imagine the culture of intimidation that continues to discourage current and past employees from coming forward to tell the truth. We need to have the ability to find out the answers as to what really went on at Ornge so that we can hold those accountable and so that the staff at Ornge can begin to develop trust within their own organization. The first step is to put in place protection from reprisals for these people coming forward with information.

We need to have these provisions in place so that the Ornge scandal, and the other scandals that will come up during this government's tenure, will be there to protect those who want to come forward and bring out the truth.

Speaker, our own Ombudsman, André Marin, has said a few things about whistle-blowing: "And let's be clear, the fact that information might embarrass government—for example, in cases of ill-advised conduct or spending—should never be seen as a legitimate reason for keeping it secret." Lastly, he says, "In my own work as the Ontario Ombudsman, whistle-blowers have served as a source of crucial information in many of the systemic investigations we have conducted." These words speak to the importance of this motion.

Speaker, I support this motion so that protections are put in place for those who want to come forward and help us uncover the truth about the Ornge scandal and other scandals that have put the lives of Ontarians at risk.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. John O'Toole:** I too will be standing in support of the motion by the member from Dufferin—Caledon.

I think it's best to sort of summarize here by saying that even the senior public servant Ron McKerlie at Ornge said recently in a public meeting, "If any of you leak information, you can be held criminally liable for obstructing a criminal investigation." This kind of muzzling, right from the leadership, is quite frightening.

This is why I support this motion. All of us, on all sides, use these terms rather casually: accountability, openness, transparency. But really this is a litany of evidence that this current government—for instance, they've known about the \$25 million that's unaccounted for; a \$1.2-million interest-free loan to the CEO, Chris Mazza, who's now fired; the numbered company Chris Mazza is still a member of, not disclosed without questioning from Frank Klees; illegitimate procurement methods; helicopters which aren't permitted to fly in US space; a mysterious \$6.7-million payout to Ornge for a profit company; EMBA's paid for by people who should be at work. The company is telling people they're afraid of reprisals.

This is the climate of openness that we have in the McGuinty government, and it comes after three or four other similar events, one more recently: eHealth. Even the Auditor General has cautioned us to be wary. Don Drummond has basically said the same thing. The Auditor General has said the same thing.

I would expect members on the government side would support Ms. Jones's motion—

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Thank you. The member for Dufferin—Caledon, you have two minutes to reply.

**Ms. Sylvia Jones:** Thank you to the NDP member from Timmins—James Bay; I really appreciated your comments.

I want to go back to the member's comments about no grey area. We've had ethical Ornge employees who have quit in disgust and were forced to sign confidentiality agreements. We have an opportunity with this resolution that we can send a very clear message that we want to hear those voices, we want to hear those stories and we

want to get to the bottom of what has been happening and continues to happen at Ornge.

With this resolution, we can send that clear message. It is disturbing that while the members who chose to speak from the Liberal Party have sent a message that we don't need it, clearly we do. We have someone who sent an email, very shortly after the article appeared in the *Star*, that said, "Given the article in the *Star*, I'm reluctant to come to Queen's Park to meet." Clearly there are people who need to tell their story, who want to share what has been happening at Ornge and feel that they are muzzled and cannot do that.

We have an opportunity with this resolution to bring that forward and to ensure that it is clearly set out in the standing orders and the Legislative Assembly Act. I quite frankly don't understand what you're afraid of. If you believe that that protection is there, then enshrine it in the standing orders. Make sure it's standing in there in the Legislative Assembly Act so that we can show the people who need to have the voices heard and need to have those stories shared, and have the confidence that they may come forward and not be persecuted—or further persecuted, I would add.

As I say, it's unfortunate that it seems the Liberals are going to go on the side of intimidation when we could be opening this up and ensuring their voices can be heard.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** We will take the vote at the end of private members' business.

## NORTHERN ONTARIO

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I move that, in the opinion of this House, a committee of the Legislative Assembly, with authority to meet at the call of the Chair, should be established as follows;

That the membership of the committee be comprised of every member of the Legislative Assembly whose electoral district lies north of the French River; and

That the committee be empowered to consider and report to the House its observations, opinions and recommendations on all policies and legislation of the province that directly impact northern Ontario; and

To which any bills whose principal focus and impact affect northern Ontario may be referred.

1430

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Mr. Vanthof has moved private member's notice of motion number 9. Pursuant to standing order 98, the member has 12 minutes for his presentation.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Thank you, Speaker. Northern Ontario: 6% of the population and 90% of the land mass. One of the places you can appreciate that, in the rest of the province, is on the big map on the east side doors. That's one of the few places outside of northern Ontario you can actually appreciate it, because when you use a road map, it's a different scale. And that's an important point to remember.

A few weeks ago, I was at a hockey game, on a Friday night. The New Liskeard Cubs lost to the Nickel City

Sons. But I was speaking to Terry Willard. Terry's the owner of a local bus line. He survived. But when they changed the bus procurement rules, what you are fighting now in the south, they didn't bother with a study or a moratorium. We found out about the moratorium after we lost all the bus lines. And there's a big difference there. On that one, we were like the canary in the coal mine, the big 48-seat canary.

Terry talked to me a long time about that, and as our conversation ended, Terry said, "You know, John, when are we going to do it?" And I said, "Do what?" He said, "Separate, before they kill our way of life."

Now, Terry is not a separatist. He's a Canadian. He's a proud Canadian. He's a father, a businessman, a community volunteer, but he's frustrated. He's more than frustrated; he's alienated, like many of us. And there's a big difference, because being frustrated and disagreeing with government policies—you know what? That's part of democracy. We don't always agree on the same things. That's part of democracy. But the difference between frustrated and alienated is when, deep down, you don't believe that you have any impact, any possible impact on government policy; when you, deep down, don't believe that you matter. That's the problem that a lot of us face in northern Ontario.

The first time I felt it personally: Probably some of you were in this House when we fought Adams mine, and in this House, the Adams Mine Lake Act was passed. There was a huge fight. It split my riding completely in two, and those scars are still there. But you know what? That was democracy. It was a bit dirty at times, but it was democracy.

Now I know, Speaker—I'm new here, I'm still learning, but now I know that between the second and third reading, you have a hearing where you're supposed to hear the people's views. Perfect. For the Adams Mine Lake Act, which was the name of it, the closest hearing—there were two hearings, actually: one in Windsor and one in Milton, seven hours away from the Adams mine. That was when the people on both sides—

**Interjection:** Did they Skype?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** There was no Skype.

The people on both sides, for and against the Adams mine, were all alienated. That was the first time I felt it personally.

But that was long enough ago, and so you say, "Oh, well, has it gotten better?" No, it hasn't, and I will name a few examples.

The Far North Act: You'll have a hard time finding someone in northern Ontario, be they First Nation or non-aboriginal, in favour of the Far North Act or portions of it.

The Endangered Species Act: Once again, good ideas, some of them, but in northern Ontario—and not just in northern Ontario—there are some threats in that act. I was at a public meeting a while ago, and it wasn't funny, but in a way it was: The only endangered species they forgot in the act was the northern, and that is a big point.

This isn't a partisan thing, because there's lots of blame to go around. We all remember the cancellation of the spring bear hunt. Once again, whether you agree or do not agree, the fact that northerners had nothing to do with it, that was alienating.

Now, there are those who are going to scoff and say, "Oh, come on. We have consultations with you guys all the time. We've had round tables, technical tables. We've had conferences, summits. We've had one-year plans, two-year plans, three-year plans." The last one, folks, was 25 years. How can we not be satisfied with a 25-year plan? And each time, northerners dutifully prepare comments, and we prepare good ones. I was president of the Federation of Agriculture when we did the 25-year plan, and we did everything we could, because we think, "You know what? We've got to be at the table, just in case this time it's for real; this time, they're going to listen."

What happens? We do our best, and then we wait. And then when they do come around—and usually it's in the four-year election cycle—most of the things we put in are somehow changed or moulded so that they appear that they're what we wanted, but when you try and make it work on the ground, it doesn't work.

A couple of weeks ago, I was at a meeting sponsored by the Timiskaming First Nation. They had a speaker there who was one of the main speakers in the conference, David Nahwegahbow, and he was describing the problem that First Nations were having with consultation. To the First Nations, consultation is two parties having a serious dialogue, and based on that dialogue they move forward on action. What the First Nations were feeling was that there was lots of dialogue, but the actions weren't based on the dialogue.

You know what? It hit me. That's what's happening to non-aboriginal northerners too. We do lots of talking, and we do everything we can, but by the time that the policies come out of the bureaucratic meat grinder that's down here, they don't look anything like what we started with. And that is a very, very big problem.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. John Vanthof:** That's one of the reasons, honourable colleague, you should vote for this.

But one of the things that I've often heard—and this is not a partisan thing. I've often heard Minister Gravelle say, a few times already, that one of the problems we're facing is the problem of balance. I fully agree. We have to return the balance, and one of the ways to do that is to create a committee of northern MPPs who would have the power, after second reading of a bill that impacts northern Ontario, to look at that bill, hold hearings if necessary with the stakeholders, and return some of the balance. Not change the bill—we're not talking about a veto. It's up to this Legislature to come up with good legislation. But it would be up to that committee to make sure that the legislation works on the ground, because having legislation that sounds really good here and works very well in the press and works very well on paper—if it doesn't work on the ground, what good is it going to do? It's not going to do any good.

With this committee, one thing we're looking at—because we realize it's not just northern Ontario that's facing these problems. I think we've faced them maybe longer because we are far more isolated, but if we did this as a pilot project, if this worked, it's a way of bringing government back to the people. It really is. I really believe that.

At the end of the day, I think the most important thing we have to realize—and I'm maybe going to step out of bounds here. But with the Endangered Species Act, people in northern Ontario are fully in favour of protecting endangered species, but the way the act is written, in some cases, you're making the species more endangered, because it works on paper, but it doesn't work in practicality.

I truly believe that if you had a committee made up of all the MPPs from northern Ontario—and once again, this isn't partisan, because I don't think anyone in this House runs other than to help their people, to work for their people. Certainly, I don't know any MPP in northern Ontario, with the miles and the hours and everything that we have to put in it—I'm just learning this—who runs for the fun of it. I truly believe they run for their people. And if you put those people in a room—and not on every act. One thing is really important here: We're not proposing this to slow things down. I truly believe that if we had a committee like this, we would actually speed things up, because northerners, aboriginal, non-aboriginal, would have a place to go where they truly believed that they would have a say at the end of the process.

1440

Once again, we don't want to have the only say, but we want to have a say to make sure that when legislation is proposed, we can look and say, "You know what? It's a good idea, but how is this going to work on the ground?"

There are going to be people who say, "Oh, this is not what we need." But what we are doing now is not working.

Since I've been elected and since I've sat in this great House, I've only heard northern Ontario mentioned a few times, and it has been with three words: Ring of Fire. And do you know what? It's a great opportunity for this province; it's a great opportunity for the north.

My colleagues in the north from all sides know we're going to run into trouble if the people of the north feel that, once again, they're being talked to but being ignored, because we've been through all this. We've been through it all before, and the First Nations have been through this all before. They've been through it for a lot longer than us.

It's time that we looked at a model of government—and the goal of this committee—that would not only make northern Ontario stronger—because, yes, I'm from northern Ontario; I want to make northern Ontario as strong as possible. But you have to realize that a strong northern Ontario can be the cornerstone of a better, stronger Ontario.

We want to be part of this province. A lot of us feel like we're a colony. We don't want to be a colony. We want to be a partner. We want to be a part of this province and help rebuild it.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mrs. Liz Sandals:** I'd like to congratulate the member from Timiskaming-Cochrane for the support that he's showing for his region of northern Ontario, for the work that he's doing to advocate for the families in his region. I truly do think that he's sincere in that advocacy.

Quite frankly, our government does recognize that northern communities face unique challenges. I think for many of us who just were at ROMA this past week or so, we've actually spent the last week talking directly to communities in northern Ontario about the challenges that are quite unique to northern Ontario, saying that we do understand that we need to work with northerners so there will be a stronger north. We totally get it that a stronger north helps build a stronger Ontario.

We do, obviously, have northern members who, unfortunately, aren't here today, because we actually tend to let our northern members go home on Thursday afternoons and try to get back into the community. We recognize it takes a bit longer to get there than it does for some of the rest of us. So, unfortunately, our northern members—which is why I'm talking, because if they were here, they would love to talk. I'm the adopted northerner or something today.

With respect to the actual motion, though, I do have some concerns. The first is, just from the point of view of making it a standing committee of the Legislature, that the membership of the committee, the way it's structured, does seem to sort of violate one of the principles on which standing committee membership is normally structured, which is proportional representation, rep by pop, within the parties that are represented here in the House. As far as I can figure out from your motion, which says ridings "north of the French River," there would be four that right now happen to be Liberal. If it had been a year ago, it would have been different, or if it had been nine years ago, it would have been different again. I recognize that, so I'm just using the situation as it happens to be right now.

There would be four Liberals on your committee, the way you've described it, because the Minister of Natural Resources—actually, he's Northern Development and Mines. Anyway, there is Superior-Greenstone, or is it Thunder Bay-Greenstone? Speaker, you've got the list of ridings there. I have a feeling I've got the riding name wrong.

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Thunder Bay-Atikokan, Thunder Bay-Superior North.

**Mrs. Liz Sandals:** Thunder Bay-Atikokan. It is Superior-Greenstone. Okay. And then Sudbury and the Soo. There's four, so four Liberal.

It appears to me that there would actually only be one PC because the wording in the motion says members of the Legislature "whose electoral district lies north of the

French River." Part of his riding lies north of the French River, so I'm assuming the member from Nipissing is in. It would appear that the other two members that I would think of as somewhat north are out, because for the member from Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke, his piece of Nipissing is south and east of the French River. I have been looking at maps very carefully today, I would like you to know. For the member for Parry Sound-Muskoka, I didn't actually have to look at the map; I knew Parry Sound was south of the French River. It would appear that we've sort of magically only got one PC member.

The NDP has five members: Timmins-James Bay, Kenora-Rainy River, Timiskaming-Cochrane, Nickel Belt and Algoma-Manitoulin. It's a good sort of gimmick. You're going from third party to first party on this committee—a good trick if you can get away with it. I'm not sure that it's quite appropriate, but I do recognize that—

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** It's not a trick. It's a genuine motion.

**Mrs. Liz Sandals:** I understand that it's a genuine motion. What I was going to say was that perhaps the way to try and get at what I understand is a genuine request for how we get these issues discussed is that maybe where we start is with something more informal with the members from northern Ontario from all parties getting to have a discussion and looking to see if there are areas of common interest in which they work.

I want to challenge you on a few things. One was the idea that the only thing that has ever been discussed in here, in mention of northern Ontario—I know the member from Timmins-James Bay has actually mentioned on a number of occasions the northern Ontario heritage fund because as we've been discussing creating southwestern Ontario and eastern Ontario development funds, the member has actually been quite enthusiastic about telling us about the success of the northern Ontario fund that you already have there. In fact, if you actually look at it—

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Created by northerners. It was created by us.

**Mrs. Liz Sandals:** That's okay. That's okay. It was a good idea. We agree you had a good idea. If you look at some of the ridings like Algoma-Manitoulin, it's provided \$70 million in direct investment, leveraging about \$263 million; \$90 million into Kenora-Rainy River, leveraging \$239 million; \$69 million into the member's riding of Timiskaming-Cochrane, leveraging over \$186 million; \$66 million into Timmins-James Bay, leveraging over \$160 million. There has been tremendous job growth that has been created, about 18,000 jobs in northern Ontario. We actually agree that that was a great idea, creating that fund, and have been investing in it.

I hope we can find another way to address what I agree is a genuine need to discuss northern issues. I don't think the idea of a formal standing committee is quite how we get there, because the rules are so unlike those of normal standing committee membership. Thank you, Speaker.

1450

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Norm Miller:** It's my pleasure to join in the debate today on ballot item number 14. The motion would require that a northern committee report its observations, opinions and recommendations to the House on anything that directly impacted northern Ontario.

As the PC critic for northern development and mines, I've travelled by car from Parry Sound–Muskoka to Kenora, to Kapuskasing, to Sault Ste. Marie, to Kirkland Lake, and I've flown to many of the most remote places in the province, including Webequie, Fort Severn, Pickle Lake and Attawapiskat.

Without exception, people in northern Ontario told me that they want the government to stop using a one-size-fits-all approach to policy and regulation. Time and again, we see that what's good for southern Ontario is not necessarily good for northern Ontario, and the member from Timiskaming–Cochrane mentioned a couple of different acts. Certainly the Endangered Species Act—you could spend a lot of time talking about how it affects northern Ontario; or the Far North Act. We have this continuing Toronto-centric decision-making coming from this government, and we have many pieces of legislation that come, frankly, from environmental lobby groups, and it's not suiting the best interests of northern Ontario.

This motion is really about a disconnect between the government and bureaucrats in cubicles who write those policies and regulations and the people in the real world, who have to live with their impact. The unintended consequences of red tape and regulation, as we have seen, is crippling. Ontario is suffering from its effects, and it points to a flawed approach to policy. It's time the province moved from risk-based to outcomes-based regulations and policy.

Personally, though, I support the principle behind this motion, and I agree with a lot of what the member from Timiskaming–Cochrane said. I cannot support this motion because, once again, a member of this Legislature has elected to exclude my riding of Parry Sound–Muskoka. It's been eight years since the last time that was done, and it was done by the current Minister of Northern Development and Mines. It was an underhanded and mean-spirited move at that time. I would like to believe, in this instance, that it was an accidental oversight on the part of one of this House's new members. Nonetheless, it's an attack on Parry Sound–Muskoka, and I cannot and will not support the motion for that reason.

To enlighten the member, Rick Williams, the commissioner of social services at the district of Muskoka says that the increase in Ontario Works welfare cases is among "the most dramatic in the province." The district reports that there was 931 cases in Muskoka in December 2011 alone, a 12.3% increase over the number of cases in November and 13.7% higher than in December 2010. Simply put, these are the highest numbers in 15 years in Muskoka, and the district anticipates further increases in

the coming months as business closures announced before Christmas—Tembec and Grandview Resort, for example—unfold this year.

Muskoka's median average income places it well behind Thunder Bay, Sault Ste. Marie and Timmins, and it has become a black hole where there are no government programs. Whereas the government creates a southwestern program and has an eastern program and has the NOHFC, Muskoka, despite its lower average incomes, is not benefiting.

The district of Parry Sound also struggles with lower than Ontario average incomes and high unemployment. If you look at all the northern ridings, Parry Sound has the lowest median household income in the north, at \$50,921, according to 2006 Statistics Canada numbers. That's \$19,000 below the provincial average. That's lower than Algoma at \$58,800. It's lower than Sault Ste. Marie at \$63,377. It's lower than Timiskaming at \$55,551. It's well below every other region.

The district of Parry Sound also features—it has many similar qualities to the north. It has five First Nations. It has unorganized territories. It has very large spaces in terms of the geography. And Parry Sound, I might point out to the member, is considered part of northern Ontario for provincial funding programs.

I know there are some other members who would like to speak to this. I simply would say that I'm disappointed that my riding is not included. I think the idea of a committee is a good idea but, unfortunately, I will not be able to support this motion today.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** It's my pleasure to get up in this chamber and support the motion brought forward by the member for Timiskaming–Cochrane. I have to tell you, I have spent many, many days in the north for the last couple of years, and everything that he speaks about in that motion, everything that he talked about in his remarks, is reflective of the sentiment that I hear from northerners every time I travel to the north, Speaker.

I'm going to talk a little bit about that, but I first want to say how shocked I am that the member from Guelph made the remarks about the northern members from the Liberal benches not being here to speak to this motion. I think that's endemic to the problem that we're trying to fix with this motion: putting an actual forum together where northern members have an opportunity to talk about the legislation that comes through this House and the impact that it has on northerners. I'm utterly disappointed—maybe not surprised, but utterly disappointed—that the member from Guelph can talk about this being a gimmick. How dare that kind of language come up when this is an extremely serious situation that northerners have been facing for so long now that they are actually contemplating breaking away from the province and joining Manitoba? That's how serious it is. So to be so flippant about this problem shows that there's a real lack of understanding on the government benches about how problematic the situation is in Ontario when

northerners don't feel like their voices are being heard in the halls of this Legislature by the government or the by bureaucrats who draft legislation.

I have to say that the idea that this is somehow a power thing and somehow a gimmick to get power is, again, extremely distasteful. Unfortunately, once again, the Liberals fall into their old pattern of everything being about them and their own power instead of about doing the right thing and doing the job that needs to be done for the people in this province and, as far as this motion goes, the people of the north. Very disappointing.

I have to say that the member for Timiskaming-Cochrane spoke about some of the very specific areas of legislation that he has been concerned about. There are many, many more. I agree with him on everything that he said. The biggie, if you will, the biggest example of the north not being heard, not being spoken to, not being listened to, was in the Far North Act. Holy smokes. We had a Far North Act rammed through this Legislature, and everybody in the north was against it. The chambers of commerce in northern communities were against the Far North Act moving forward. Every First Nation community across the north was against, opposed to, the Far North Act moving forward. The heads of municipalities and all of the elected officials in all of the municipalities in northern ridings were against the Far North Act going forward. What did the Liberals do? They rammed through the Far North Act. So if there's one thing that's very symbolic about how northerners are not having their issues dealt with by this Liberal government, it's the Far North Act. It is symbolic of the problem that has been ongoing for a long time—as we watch the forestry sector fall apart in the north and lose over 40,000 good-paying jobs, by the way, Speaker.

I just want to say one last thing, because I know there are other members in my caucus who want to speak about this. It's not just the big policy pieces; it's the implementation, as the member from Parry Sound-Muskoka was indicating. It's the implementation; it's the regs. In northern Ontario, for example, if you work for a social services agency, you have to travel sometimes 40 minutes between clients, sometimes two hours between clients, sometimes three hours between clients. If you're delivering home care services, that's the kind of travel time that you have between clients. When I go to the north and I talk to the people who sit on the social services boards there, the mayors and the municipal representatives, they are beside themselves because they get the same amount of administrative cost coverage as is happening in the south, when it is a completely different situation. They simply cannot afford to provide the kinds of services that need to be provided and that should be provided equally to all Ontarians on the same kind of dime that gets allotted in the south.

1500

It's that cookie-cutter approach that is simply not working for the north, that hasn't worked for the north for a long time and that we need to address, and the only way to seriously get at it is to get serious about putting a

committee together that will be a lens on these kinds of problems and bring forward not partisan suggestions but practical, pragmatic suggestions of how we can start fixing the real problems that northerners are facing.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I'm pleased to have the opportunity to participate in the discussion this afternoon on the motion that's been put forward by the member from Timiskaming-Cochrane. I recall a number of years ago, when I think the International Plowing Match was held in Timiskaming-Cochrane for the very first time. I believe the current member was very involved—and I know that his uncle, the member from Oxford, has just helped me here to verify the historical record that indeed he was instrumental in the organization. I know from people in my riding of Peterborough who were up to that International Plowing Match that they still have many fond memories of the great hospitality that was shown by the people of the north and, indeed, the people from that particular riding.

You know, it's interesting that when you divide lines in northern Ontario, it's always been the subject of some interesting debate. I heard the member from Parry Sound-Muskoka articulate very well some of the concerns that have always been put forward when we start delineating on the map. Indeed, his former federal colleague from Parry Sound-Muskoka, a very good friend of mine, Andy Mitchell, who served so ably as a federal member and federal cabinet minister—we've always had discussions about delineating that line in northern Ontario and the impact that has on programming for northern Ontario. I think that inherent in this motion today is an opportunity, if this committee does get established, to look at ways we can be perhaps a touch more flexible and certainly give the opportunity to include the riding of Parry Sound-Muskoka, because I think good arguments can be made for the inclusion of Parry Sound-Muskoka with this particular motion.

There have been a number of key initiatives in northern Ontario in the last number of years. I certainly want to give the official opposition credit. During their term in government they established the northern medical school, and I always believe in giving credit where credit is due. During our time in government, of course, we developed an architectural school in northern Ontario and, indeed, a law school in northern Ontario to provide the academic training for those professional areas, along with the medical school, to assist the north in many areas to have those professions in place, which many of us in the House would agree are the building blocks for a very successful future.

We also, of course, have the Ring of Fire development, which I'm told has the largest deposit of chromite in the world, a material that's going to be in increasing demand. Particularly, evolving communities and economies—China, India, Brazil and other nations—are certainly going to demand chromite for a wide variety of steel processing and other manufacturing activities. So in

future, like nickel, copper and other minerals, we certainly believe the Ring of Fire has unlimited potential for northern Ontario.

This forum that has been proposed here this afternoon can bring individuals together, and I'd just like to encourage the member for Timiskaming-Cochrane—I just happen to have an article here from the Thunder Bay Chronicle-Journal, and I think what's described in this article is a need for a little more outreach for other members in northern Ontario, indeed, to be kind of fully briefed on what the intent of this legislative committee is all about. I know that in my case, some of my colleagues have not had the opportunity to take a look at this legislative committee, and it's an opportunity that they would like to have before this committee is in place.

I think there are some very good elements in what's being proposed this afternoon. I think it needs to move forward. But I would actually include the riding of Parry Sound-Muskoka.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** I rise today to thank the member from Timiskaming-Cochrane for what I consider to be a very thoughtful motion.

There are areas of improvement that are needed, as you've heard about, but nonetheless, the very fact that you had to bring something like this to the Legislature speaks to the fact that there's a demand for a northern Ontario voice.

As a former mayor of the city of North Bay for seven years, I can tell you that we looked at the government and thought, like you, "They believe that Ontario ends at Steeles Avenue." As we travelled a little bit, and as the province developed, we think—we believe—they now think it ends at Vaughan. But nonetheless, they absolutely do not take a northern Ontario lens to anything at all.

I'm going to give you perhaps only one example today of why I believe in what you're doing today. I'll give you the story about Bill 26, oddly enough named the Strong Communities Act.

Now, here I am, as the mayor of the city of North Bay at that time, and I read about this Bill 26 coming, and I think, "Do they not have a clue about what is northern Ontario?" It is one that pretty much closed off the \$40-million industrial park in North Bay because there are wetlands, and this Strong Communities Act stops you from building where wetlands are. I can understand why that's so important here in the GTA; I understand why. But in northern Ontario, our exemption is that if you need to build on a wetland, you can re-create that equal amount of wetland elsewhere in northern Ontario.

So in North Bay, the provincial government, the federal government and the municipality spent tens of millions of dollars to build an industrial park and, yes, it was built on a wetland years ago. But now today, under Bill 26, you cannot build in our industrial park. So we now have a \$40-million industrial park with fully serviced streets. We've got paved roads, fire hydrants,

utility poles, high-speed Internet—it must be the only wetland park that has Internet access.

It's unbelievable that the members of this government would pass a bill, not understanding that northern Ontario is built on rock and swamp. Sadly, those are the words we use: We're built on rock and we're built on swamp. There's nothing else. We have built beautiful cities on our rock and on our wetlands. We have built remarkable cities.

As mayor, I was so thrilled to be able to take 100 acres of wetland and turn it over to our conservation authority. We were able to take a wetland and build a huge retail complex at the entrance of the city, but replicate that wetland that we covered and move it and rebuild wetland in another area of the city, with wooden boardwalks, signage—it's a nature preserve. It's beautiful. We made something beautiful, because that was what we needed to do.

So here we are, with this \$40-million wetland that we can no longer build on in northern Ontario, and that's because we do not take a northern Ontario lens and shine it on what this bill does for Toronto and area and the rest of Ontario, and what kind of impact this bill will have on northern Ontario. Had they only taken this approach that the member from Timiskaming-Cochrane is suggesting, they would have realized it's not good for northern Ontario.

So I commend you on this approach. It needs a little finessing to correctly satisfy the member from Muskoka and the member from Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke. But I commend you on your bill, and I thank you for it. And I thank you for shining the lens on northern Ontario, even if it's only for these few short minutes this afternoon. Congratulations to you.

**1510**

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Thank you. Further debate?

**Ms. Sarah Campbell:** Whether it's jobs, the cost of living or what northerners do in their spare time, it's clear that governments are always trying to tell northerners what to do and how to do it. It's very paternalistic, and I think today it's clear for the people in the northwest, if they were ever unsure, that the Liberals just don't care about us in the north.

I'll be honest when I say that I was extremely offended by the comments made by the member from Guelph—to let some of the northern members go home early because their ridings are so far away. Well, I can tell you that nobody in Ontario has a larger riding than I do, at about 300,000 square kilometres, and I live the furthest away—

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** And here you are.

**Ms. Sarah Campbell:** Yeah, and I'm here. I'm here doing work. I think it's sad and it's telling that the Liberal members would rather go home than stay here, engage and do some meaningful things for their constituents.

There are a few other things. I wanted to talk about hydro. Again, the lack of consultation about our hydro-

electricity system has resulted in an unfair hydro system for people living in the north, where the people living in the north actually subsidize the cost for people living in the south. Despite having our own grid and producing electricity at about 2.5 cents a kilowatt hour, despite having colder and longer winters, despite the fact that a person in Kenora pays about \$50 more a month for electricity than they would if they lived a couple of hundred kilometres away in Winnipeg, and despite the fact that a large industrial operation in Ontario in the northwest pays about \$1.1 million more a month for electricity, and this is about twice as much as a company would pay if they were operating in Manitoba or Quebec—and we wonder what's happened to our mills and our forest industry? It also begs the question of what will happen, with the ridiculous and prohibitive electricity costs—what that will do with the Ring of Fire.

I wanted to talk about a few other things, but all I want to leave you with is the fact that life in the north is different. We need people at the table who understand the north. We've seen what kind of solutions we get when we have people at the table making decisions that affect us and who don't understand our culture, values or needs. It's time that we put northerners at the table too, and I'm proud to support this motion.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Thank you. Further debate?

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** It's a pleasure to join the debate on the motion from the member from Timiskaming—Cochrane today, and I commend him for bringing forth the motion. However, I'm in the same boat as my friend from Parry Sound—Muskoka with regard to this motion. I would have liked to hear at some point during the debate the member say that he includes all areas that are currently within northern Ontario. My riding is Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, so a very small portion of my riding is actually in northern Ontario: the townships of South Algonquin, which include the hamlets of Whitney and Madawaska, nothing big.

When my friend from Parry Sound—Muskoka talks about low incomes, well, the incomes in Renfrew county are the second-lowest of any county in the province of Ontario. The only county that's lower is the county of Haliburton. The lowest in my riding is not within the county of Renfrew; it's actually in the townships of South Algonquin. There is nothing to sustain economic development. We've got two major businesses there, both of them lumber mills, and we know what the McGuinty government has done to the lumbering and forestry industry in this province.

So my section of northern Ontario is, I'm absolutely certain, the poorest in northern Ontario, yet it is excluded from the benefit of this committee. For that reason—and as I said, we were waiting for the member to include all parts of northern Ontario that are currently within northern Ontario by definition, and all of the district of Nipissing is part of northern Ontario. My riding would be excluded from this committee as it is written right now. So, for that reason, I have no choice but to stand with the

people that I represent in the townships of South Algonquin and vote against this motion.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member from Algoma—Manitoulin.

**Mr. Michael Mantha:** I'll be very brief, Mr. Speaker, and thank you.

Nothing more, nothing less is what we're asking for for northern Ontario—just a voice.

I will argue with you that this will bring the relationships between north and south, rural and urban, a lot closer. It will give us that opportunity to engage with the rest of the province.

Nothing more, nothing less is what we're asking for. We just want to be part of the decision mechanism. We want to be there at the table. We want to be involved. We want to have a voice. We want to have a say. We want to participate in building Ontario to become the province that it should be and will be, but we need to be part of it. Nothing more, nothing less.

All we want is basically to be part of the solution in building Ontario—nothing more, nothing less. No games, no partisanship—we just want to be part of it. We want to be there with you. We want to be amongst this province in order to build it to where it should be.

Interviews in northern Ontario communities are not consultation with municipalities and our mayors and our First Nations. Sitting and having interviews over at the local shop is not consultation. We want to be engaged, we want to be at the table, and we want to be sitting there, is the message that we're trying to convey to this government and our friends across the way.

Bring us together, establish this committee, and let's build Ontario.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** In the last Parliament, the one before, many bills came forward that absolutely made no sense for northern Ontario. I'd like to start with the Narcotics Safety and Awareness Act. Is there a problem with narcotics in this province? Absolutely. Is there any geographical area of the province where narcotics are prominent? It is in northern Ontario. But the narcotics problem in northern Ontario is very different from what's happening in southern Ontario.

I begged, I pleaded, I put out a motion. I said, "Come to the North, because we're putting forward a solution. I'm all in favour. It will do great work for some of the people down south, but the people up north need help too, when we have 50% of a community addicted to narcotics. Those people need help." But they never came.

We now have a bill that helps some of the people some of the time if they live down south, but the narcotics epidemic has gotten worse in northern Ontario, not better.

Then we have bills like the Excellent Care for All Act. It looks good. I get it, Mr. Speaker. If somebody does a thousand surgeries, they will be better, faster and get better outcomes. I get all of this. But what does that mean for the 34 little hospitals in northern Ontario? That means

that you pick at the programs and services they offer until there's nothing left in there and they self-implode. The people in northern Ontario still need access to health care. They still need access to their hospitals. Sometimes the hospital is the only show in town. But we have this idea that better, bigger, faster, gives better outcomes. I get that. But it comes at a cost, and the cost is always borne by the people of northern Ontario who lose their access.

This committee will help everyone in this Legislature understand that the reality of northern Ontario counts.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member for Timiskaming–Cochrane has two minutes to reply.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** Thank you, Speaker. First off, I would like to thank all the members who had comments. As far as a test of who is and isn't in northern Ontario, I think we have to have a passion meter, because the passionate speakers were from northern Ontario.

I am not partisan on this issue at all, but there are two comments that I take some exception to. One is the word "gimmick." This is not a gimmick. Anyone who has known me in my past—I don't do gimmicks. That's one comment I take exception to.

As a new member, sometimes I don't read my stuff, because I just get too much stuff. But I don't buy that some of the people across the way knew nothing about this when it's published. I don't buy that it's totally new. One other thing—do you know what? The heritage fund is a great thing, but it's always used whenever we bring something up about northern Ontario. It's always, "Oh, but we give you so much from the heritage fund." Do you know what? This city was built on Kirkland Lake's gold. Just hold it a minute here. Once again, this province will be built on the back of the Ring of Fire. So let's build it together and let's build it so this time northerners and First Nations all benefit from it, because riches have come out of northern Ontario—billions of today's dollars—and we have people living in squalor. So while we argue who is or isn't, let's get this committee on the road and start fixing it. It's what we have to do. I ask for your support. Thank you.

1520

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Thank you. We'll take the vote at the end of private members' business.

## REGISTERED HUMAN RESOURCES PROFESSIONALS ACT, 2012

### LOI DE 2012 SUR LES PROFESSIONNELS EN RESSOURCES HUMAINES INSCRITS

Mr. Zimmer moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 28, An Act respecting the Human Resources Professionals Association / Projet de loi 28, Loi concernant l'Association des professionnels en ressources humaines.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Pursuant to standing order 98, the member has 12 minutes for his presentation.

**Mr. David Zimmer:** Thank you, Speaker. First, I'd like to thank my co-sponsors, the member from Whitby–Oshawa and the member from Beaches–East York, for supporting this initiative. As always, I appreciate their support in co-sponsoring this private member's bill. I would also like to acknowledge the presence of the leadership of the Human Resources Professionals Association: the CEO, Bill Greenhalgh; the chair of the board, Daphne FitzGerald; the vice-president of regulatory affairs and registrar, Claude Balthazard; and last but not least, Scott Allinson, the vice-president of public affairs.

I'd like to start off my remarks with a reference to a study that HRPA carried out last year. As we all know, every Ontarian is touched by work. It gives us dignity, it gives us purpose, it sustains our family and it creates wealth and growth for this province. But how happy, how satisfied and how safe we are in our work depends largely on organizations that implement the various laws that govern the Ontario workplace.

An organization that is lax in its applications of the Occupational Health and Safety Act jeopardizes the health and well-being of its workers and the bottom line of business; while an employer that complies with the Employment Standards Act is doing its part to ensure suitable workplaces in Ontario. HRPA looked at Ontario businesses that were convicted by the ESA employment standards tribunal between October 2008 and January 2010. There were 489 convictions in this period. The essential finding was that of the 489 ESA convictions, none—none—of those businesses convicted an employer who had an HRPA member. That's right, none.

Although there are many explanations that might explain these findings, it is clear that the presence of HRPA members in organizations is linked to workplace issues. As most of you are aware, HRPA regulates the human resource profession in Ontario and issues the certified human resources professional designation. That's the national standard of excellence in human resources management. HRPA is committed to advancing the human resources profession to ensure that HR is a full partner in developing and executing organizational strategy and the creation of equitable workplaces.

The 20,000 members of HRPA work in over 8,000 organizations in Ontario that employ more than two million workers, in all industries and all sectors of our economy. They are committed to building fair and equitable workplaces for Ontario workers. HR professionals are the bridge between employee and employer to ensure both parties are aware of the rights and responsibilities under the province's workplace rules and regulations.

Since receiving their 1990 act, HRPA has regulated the HR profession in Ontario by setting standards of practice to protect the public interest. In sum, its regula-

tory framework seeks to ensure that human resources professionals are competent in their work and behave in an ethical manner. HRP A determines for its members, for instance, the right to set standards for who may enter the profession; the right to set standards of practice for those working in the profession; the right to create rules for when and how members may be removed from the profession; the power to regulate the practice of members; the power to establish a professional liability insurance requirement; the power to establish requirements for membership and certification; and the power to discipline members.

Mr. Speaker, some have asked what this bill will do for members of HRP A. The bill provides HRP A members the long-sought recognition as true professionals. As business practices, economic conditions, workforce composition and employee expectations are all becoming more complex and interrelated, so have the demands of the professionalism of HRP A members. The function of HR—

*Interjection.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Order.

**Mr. David Zimmer:**—professionals now has many of the aspects of a profession, including—

*Interjections.*

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Thank you, Speaker. I got your warning.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** There are a couple of discussions going on, not just yours. So I would just ask everybody to lower their voice.

**Mr. David Zimmer:** Thank you, Speaker.

The function of HR professionals now has many of the aspects of a profession, as I was saying, including a representative professional organization; a published code of ethics and professional conduct; benchmark performance standards to ensure professional competence; ongoing skills development requirements; and finally, a growing public perception of HR as a profession, as a result of HRP A's efforts to promote HR's essential and strategic role as a critical business partner in Ontario's economy.

I believe it is vital that HRP A members have a vehicle to evolve and deliver credible HR management that will create and foster success in the Ontario workplace. It will enable HRP A to ensure the quality of the HR profession in Ontario, more control over their own destiny as a profession, the ability to command a premium in the marketplace, increased ability to influence public policy, increased attractiveness of HR as a career choice, and controlling the use of unauthorized individuals of the CHRP designation.

What this bill will provide is more regulatory teeth for HRP A to better protect the public, employers and their employees. This is acknowledged when the public becomes aware of the fact that there are trained professionals in the field who follow appropriate standards. The continuing professional development of HRP A members provides reassurance that people are treated fairly and

legally by practitioners. This bill will assist HRP A and its members to evolve into a strong and credible tier-one profession.

Bill 28 will update their existing act to provide checks and balances for the public and members of HRP A. A few examples will be: ensuring that the statutory procedures act, 1990, will protect the rights of members; HRP A would be required to abide by the fair registration practices code, which is section 2 and 3 of the Fair Access to Regulated Professions and Compulsory Trades Act; and the application of the powers are subject to the bylaws which must be ratified by the membership.

1530

Another distinction would be that HRP A's board would include three individuals who are not members of the association or a self-regulating human resources body and who are appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. These board members would, in effect, represent the public interest and would, along with the board's elected and appointed members, be charged with implementing a regulatory regime that contemplates HR members' certification requirements, the complaints process, the discipline process and the professional standards.

The legislation will also add HRP A to the Fair Access to Regulated Professions Act, which it has voluntarily adopted already—two years ago—as a testimony to its commitment to the transparent, objective and impartial standards that they're going to apply to all.

Individually, when an HR professional joins the association, they agree to abide by the professional code of conduct that commits them to professional competence and legal requirements, dignity in the workplace, balancing interests between employee and employer, confidentiality, conflict of interest, professional growth and the support of all other professionals.

I'd also note that Bill 28 has a lot to offer Ontario business. As business practices, economic conditions, workforce demographics and employee expectations all become more complex, HR professionals are at the centre of this rapid change. Its members make significant contributions to the productivity and success of the business community and organizations of all types. Members possess a high level of professionalism. They provide human capital and management know-how. It creates huge value for the organizations that employ them. The bill will make sure that as the world of HR is changing, so are the needs of employers to have qualified HR staff to ensure their compliance with government regulations.

Let me say a few words about the support that the bill has garnered since it was introduced. HRP A sought an independent expert opinion on the bill from Richard Steineke, a legal expert. He has supported it fully.

In general, Bill 28 supports a modern professional regulation statute. It addresses various gaps in the current profession. It provides many advantages to the public in support of the profession. In short, this is good for employers, this is good for employees and this is really, really good for Ontario's economy.

Mr. Speaker, I've gone over my time again today.

**Interjection:** No, you haven't.

**Interjection:** You've got a minute and half.

**Mr. David Zimmer:** I have a minute and a half? I'll leave some time for you. Thank you.

I know there is another member on this side that wants to speak to it. But in summary, let me make this point: Ontario's economy is at that very sophisticated point. It's at that point where its size, it's at that point where its complexity, require a highly professional human resource professional cadre to work with sophisticated management; to work with sophisticated things that government is doing; to ensure that Ontario has the finest possible workplace environment. That attracts business. That sustains business. That sustains employees. That is good for everybody in Ontario: man, woman and child.

I urge my colleagues in this House from all sides of the Legislature to follow their members' lead—to follow the Conservative member who will be speaking to the bill, to follow the lead of the NDP member who will be supporting the bill—and to follow my lead and ensure the passage of this legislation.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member for Whitby—Oshawa.

**Mrs. Christine Elliott:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure to co-sponsor and speak to this bill, and also to welcome our guests to the gallery today.

As you might be aware, the Human Resources Professionals Association, or HRPA, has almost 20,000 members in the province of Ontario, and I'm proud to say that almost 1,000 members are in my riding and the surrounding area. I had the pleasure of meeting with Tracy Starrett from the HRPA Durham chapter just last week to speak to Bill 28, and assured her of my support for it.

As my colleague has stated, a regulated human resources profession is obviously in the interest of employees, but the bill also has much to offer Ontario's businesses as well as to the public. Human resource professionals are often seen as champions of change as organizations continually assess and seek to increase their operational effectiveness. They know how to link this change to the strategic needs of the operation while getting employees on side. As you know, Ontario businesses are in the midst of great change as business practices, economic conditions, workforce demographics and labour law all become more complex and inter-related. Human resource professionals are at the centre of this rapid change. HRPA recently completed a study that verifies what HRPA has felt strongly for some time: that there is a correlation between the certified human resources professional, known as the CHRP, designation and the continuing professionalization of human resources, as well as the velocity and trajectory of the members' career growth.

The public can place greater confidence in accredited professionals such as those human resource practitioners who hold the CHRP designation. The updated regulatory powers resulting from Bill 28 would enable HRPA to better protect the public interest from incompetent or

unethical human resource practitioners, help prevent abuse of corporate positions and, if abuse should occur, provide the public with an effective means by which to seek recourse. Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, Bill 28 is good for the public and employers here in the province of Ontario.

HRPA members make huge contributions to the success and productivity of the business community and organizations of all types. As regulated professionals, HRPA members specifically possess a high level of professionalism and human capital management knowledge that creates enormous value for the organizations that employ them. Human resource professionals provide value by first of all identifying workforce trends and forecasting changes before they happen, discovering potential problems before they materialize and adversely impact the organization, identifying key talent for retention and leadership development and forecasting changes in human capital resources within the organization and in the changing economic environment. To sum up their key role in Ontario organizations, human resource professionals put the right people in the right place at the right time.

One specific area where I personally believe that human resource professionals can be of great assistance is with respect to the employment of people with disabilities. Many people with disabilities are currently receiving Ontario disability support payments not because they want to, or maybe not even need to, but because they're simply unable to find employment. Many employers are still reluctant to hire people with disabilities, particularly people with mental health challenges, due in large part to a lack of knowledge and associated stigma.

This is not merely a challenge but an economic challenge. As Dr. Rick Miner indicated in his 2010 report *People Without Jobs, Jobs Without People*, within the next five to 10 years Ontario is going to be facing a significant shortage of skilled workers, so we need to ensure the placement of as many people as possible into the labour market, including women, people with disabilities, aboriginal people and older workers. Human resource professionals are key to this transformation of our workplace. Regulated human resource professionals commit to career-long learning that keeps them at the leading edge of human capital management. Human resources, or people, as any business person knows, are an organization's greatest competitive advantage.

They also commit to a human-resource-specific code of professional conduct. These rules provide assurance to both employers and employees that there are clear guidelines defining the professional conduct of all HRPA members. The rules cover areas including competence, legal requirements, dignity in the workplace, balancing interests, confidentiality, conflict of interest and professional growth and support of other professionals.

Some have said that the bill will be a burden to employers. Mr. Speaker, I would say to you that this is simply false. One has to keep in mind that membership in

the HRPAs are voluntary, and the CHRP designation is also voluntary. Nothing forces human resource professionals to be members of the association or forces human resource professionals to obtain the CHRP designation. The same is true with employers. This bill does not force them to hire CHRPs for their firms and businesses.

Some stakeholders have indicated that the impact of Bill 28 for employers, especially the part on investigations and entry without warrant, puts businesses at risk if they hire a CHRP. You could call this a Trojan horse concern; that is, by hiring HRPAs, employers open their businesses to investigation by HRPAs.

1540

Employers need not be concerned about this for the following reasons. First, any investigation conducted by HRPAs would need to relate to specific allegations of professional misconduct on behalf of a member. HRPAs investigators would not simply be allowed to go on a fishing expedition. All information sought would need to be relevant to the allegations.

It's also the case that any disciplinary actions taken by the association can only be directed at members and firms registered with HRPAs. HRPAs has no independent jurisdiction with respect to employers.

It's also worth noting that all 39 public acts governing professions in Ontario include sections that deal specifically with powers of investigation. Although there are differences in the details, the powers of investigation are very similar across regulated professions.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that in the 20 years HRPAs has been in existence, the CHRP has been very successful in demonstrating its value. If anything, Bill 28 will increase the value of the CHRP designation.

Between HRPAs members' commitment to professional excellence, their unique role as a bridge between employers and employees, and the key business role in getting the right people in the right place at the right time, I believe Bill 28 is a win-win for everyone.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member for Beaches–East York.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** It is my privilege, my honour, to stand here today on this human resource professionals bill.

I would like to thank my colleague from Willowdale and my colleague from Whitby—Ajax–Whitby now, isn't it?

**Interjection:** Whitby–Oshawa.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Whitby–Oshawa now. Okay, Whitby–Oshawa. I'm just happy to co-sponsor this bill.

It has been a long time coming. It is a bill that is going to better regulate the HRPAs and is going to serve, I think, the people of this province well, not only the people who work in that profession but all of the people who work in industry, in commerce, in businesses across this entire province.

Twenty-some years ago, the province recognized a need to regulate the industry. We looked upon it in the early 1990s and said, "This is an industry that needs to be

self-regulated. This is an industry that is up and coming." The first efforts were made to do the right thing.

I remember, going back some 20 years, my own dealings with HR people. My dealings in those days were with the federal government. We had HR people who worked throughout the federal government. I was on the union side. I often had to deal with them; I had to negotiate with them. They were there during grievance hearings; they were there during consultations on contracts; they were there when people got hired or fired; they were there even to run the training programs.

I must say that I have nothing but the highest respect, from those days, for the people who worked in this industry, because although it was fledgling, at least to many places—the federal government was there. There were not a lot of industries or businesses that had them.

Although there was some suspicion from amongst us lefty union types at the time, I have to say, over my many years of relating with them and beside them, that they were always honest and they always showed an immense integrity. So, when they gave their word, when they said something was going to happen, when they sat down to try to change the rules and the regulations under which we worked, it was always done in a way that was fair.

In fact, my wife, who was at that point a federal public employee, decided that maybe she wanted to get into the HR business, and she left the safe sinecure of public life, working for the immigration department—she worked there for a brief period with me after she left the anti-inflation board—and went off to become an HR person herself. She worked for more than 20 years, starting first of all with Employment and Immigration, and later ended her career at Service Canada.

I got to know, not only through what she was doing, but all the people with whom she worked: people who devoted their lives to the service of the people of Canada, to the government of Canada, to their employer, but also to the people who had to have their problems resolved. Throughout that entire period of time, as I can say, it went from almost a transactional activity to one that was seen to be part and parcel of what you did every day in the business of serving the people of our country, in enacting and enforcing the laws of our country, just as we enforced the laws around immigration access to Canada and those that ran afoul of it.

There were also people who did the same thing when it came to dealing with unions and for those few—very few—who ran afoul of what they were supposed to have done or who stepped over the line. There was an HR person to look at it sympathetically and honestly, and give, I think in all cases, the very best of advice. As I know happened where I worked, I know it happened and continues to happen in workplaces across this province.

Over those last 23 years that I've been in government as an elected person, I've seen a huge change. As one left the federal government and became involved in municipal politics and then later here, you saw the kinds of laws that are enforced, the kinds of laws that come to the fore,

that were there before when this act was first brought forward.

We now have a whole reliance upon employment equity, and even though that may still be contentious to some people and even though it may not have gone as far as many would like to have seen it go, there are and continue to be provisions for employment equity that have to be looked at with some considerable sympathy and understanding.

We also have a far more diverse population, and we have to look at the diversity provisions to make sure that ordinary people have an opportunity to work. We have to accommodate disabilities in ways that we did not do 20 years ago. Certainly, I remember in this Legislature in 2005 that we passed the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, which HR people now are having to look at very carefully in terms of business place practice.

We also now are much more mindful of violence and harassment in the workplace than ever before, which is also a responsibility of HR people and why they need to have a new act.

This bill leaves rights, as they've had in the past, to set standards, entry requirements and protection, but it now gives new governance tools, and I think that's what is important and why I agreed to be one of the co-sponsors. The new governance tools are going to allow this group to better manage their own affairs and to better manage the people with whom they work, the people who are their colleagues, the people who come together to form the association, to make sure there is a consistent and good standard, to make sure that if there are any bad apples, they are removed, to make sure that there is proper training and also to make sure that there is opportunity.

When the bill was last before this Legislature, there were some criticisms. I know that criticisms were received by all members of the House. I know that my colleague, the member for Parkdale-High Park, received some of those criticisms and, when she spoke in this House, tried to mirror some of those criticisms that she had heard. I think we have a duty, when we hear that bills may not be right, to make them known, because we speak on behalf of not just one group but on behalf of all Ontarians when it comes to the passage of a bill.

The Legislature in its wisdom agreed to pass the bill at second reading, on the last occasion, and sent it to committee. But unfortunately, like so many private members' bills, it never went through committee and, of course, it never went to third reading.

But I have to say that may have been a good thing, because although it did not pass at that time, the criticisms that were heard have now been dealt with. The criticisms that were there are now gone. Whereas last time I had several letters, I had phone calls, I had people who were disgruntled within the organization, people who didn't like certain directions or phrases within the bill, this time I have received none. I shouldn't say that. I received one from a professor, but it was more academic than actually legal. But from actual HR members I have

received not one, single criticism. I don't know whether any other members have, but I have not, and I think that what has happened here is that the fears that were there have been assuaged. The legislation has been changed ever so slightly to accommodate those concerns that people had. So today you have a bill, I think, that everyone can respect, everyone can vote for, and everyone, I hope, will. It's been brought back.

1550

HR will be able to interpret and guide employers and employees through myriad pieces of legislation and will have to be on top of it. They will ensure that all of our laws here in the province of Ontario are upheld. They will be able to advise on changes as laws and jurisprudence change.

You know, we are a country of laws. We are a country that looks upon decisions that are made in tribunals and courts. We interpret those in light of what the legislation says. We also will rely on people in human resources to tell us when the laws are no longer working for the people of Ontario, so that this Legislature, or perhaps through regulation, the minister, may be able to make the appropriate changes.

If we do not have a body with whom we can deal that has that authority, it will make it much more difficult when those laws need to be changed, when we have to look at what the courts or the tribunals are interpreting, whether or not that is in the best interests of the people of Ontario—to the business community, to unions and to everyone else. They will be able to advise and enforce the internal code of conduct so that if they do have members who are stepping over the line, they will have that internal ability to do so. What they are asking to be granted is no different than we have granted to engineers, no different than we have granted to other health professionals who have their own act and their own ability to discipline.

HR people, the ones who are here today, have a commitment to professionalism, to protection, to being objective and to doing objective investigations. I trust that we will be giving them the additional tools to do not only the good job that I have witnessed throughout my entire working life but to actually do a better one.

They have signed, and they are to be commended for this, schedule 1 of the Fair Access to Regulated Professions Act. What that means is that they acknowledge that their organization will be transparent, fair and impartial for all Ontarians. It means that if somebody comes forward with credentials from another place, they will honestly look at them. It means that they will ensure that people who have the qualifications will be able to get the job, no matter where they came from and what language they speak or where they were born. It means that they will be treated with equity. It means that they recognize the diversity of the province of Ontario.

I want to thank the human resources professionals for the work they have done. I know they have done tremendous work over the past year or so since the act

was last here before us, and that it is today a better act and one we can all support.

I am mindful of this bill, if it passes today, will have to go to committee. I am asking members of all sides of this House to please give the appropriate tool to this group. They require it; Ontario requires it. As so many private member's bills end up going to committee and die there, this is not a time to allow this to happen here. I am asking that this go to the appropriate committee—and I'm trusting that the member from Willowdale, if it passes, will send it to the appropriate committee—that the committee take and seize hold of it, that they hold whatever public hearings are necessary, that they pass whatever changes might be necessary in committee and that they bring it back to the House. I am asking the government side, if at all possible, to deal with it expeditiously and to bring it back to the House for third and final reading, if that is appropriate.

The people of Ontario are relying upon this. The people of the Human Resources Professionals Association have done a lot of work, and they ought not to be thwarted when they have come this close. For today, please, everyone, vote for it for the future. Please, everyone, make sure that it becomes law in Ontario.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member from Mississauga-Streetsville.

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** It's said that there is nothing more powerful than a good idea whose time has come. In the world of private members' bills, this good idea sometimes needs an encore performance before it is enacted. Let us hope, and I join with the member for Beaches-East York in this, that this is indeed its time.

I would like to talk not so much about what the bill is, because the members who have spoken before me—the bill's presenter, the member from Willowdale, the member from Whitby-Oshawa and my colleague from Beaches-East York—have done a pretty good job of explaining what the bill is. I'd like to talk a little bit about what important things the bill does. The first thing I'd like to say is that what this does is update a piece of 22-year-old legislation. By updating the codes of practice of the profession, it places competent and ethical conduct above that of simply earning a living. It moves the practice of human resources from being merely an occupation and does codify those things which make it a profession.

I think it's worth starting with a little bit of perspective. The roots of this particular profession: If we go back even in the lifetime of many of us, hiring was something that very often was done by management based upon its feel, its intuition. In the lifetime of many of us here, that practice became known as "personnel." As the personnel practice evolved into the human resources profession, it acquired and developed a set of core principles and it used, and I think more importantly, was able to teach a body of knowledge such that it could set out a series of principles that it could govern itself through, a series of recognized and uniform standards, and move forward through the evolution and leadership

of the people who actually practise human resources. That lands us where we are today, and this is why it's an important thing for this Legislature to enact.

Today in Ontario, some 20,000 people earn a living practising what we often call "human resources." Among the things that this bill does, and does I think very well, is to raise the recognition of the profession. By raising its role you increase the acceptance of the profession and you go beyond where it's a voluntary standard to a point where employers expect it of you. They feel if you're serious about making a career in human resources, then you should be serious enough to absorb the body of knowledge and qualify for the CHRP designation, which says to the rest of the world, "I'm good at what I do. I've absorbed and I can apply a body of competent and coherent professional knowledge." It also gives the profession and those who practise it a reputation. It's essential to preserving and improving the reputation of that profession.

Having a profession governed and regulated as is proposed in this bill gives the body, the HR professional association, a means of supporting its members, supporting them through professional development, being able to regulate the practice of the profession, being able to deal with some of the issues that arise in any profession. What it does is, it places the human resources profession on much the same plane as it does engineering, accounting, law and all of the others.

The other important function that I think is worth mentioning is consistency. If the HR profession has a body of knowledge that it can apply consistently, then you know that if someone has cleared the hurdles and they can say that they've achieved their CHRP designation, then you know that they have a body of knowledge that's consistent with a set of accepted standards so as an employer, to put it in the vernacular, you know what it is you're buying.

Finally, I think it's important to recognize that it gives the association the authority not merely to speak for its members but the authority to regulate the work that its members do and to resolve issues and disputes within the profession. I think this is important. I think it's one of the major areas in which the act from 22 years ago has been updated, modernized, strengthened and made consistent and compatible with the standards held by most other regulated professions today.

I'd like to say a few words here about the profession. This doesn't affect the transferability of the CHRP designation for members. It shouldn't increase dues or costs, and most of what's in the act clarifies functions largely the way they're done today.

I have to commend the association on a lot of the homework and consultation they did. There were many communications, efforts, articles, newsletters, chapter visits and so on over the past three years. In fact, the profession sought independent legal opinions and it came to a conclusion that the proposals are, in fact, good for their members. And like my colleague who just spoke before me, while I did hear from some members of the

profession both ways at the time that we had the previous reading on this a little less than a year ago, for this particular reading we've heard no comments one way or the other, and there seems to be an acceptance that what's in this bill is, in fact, good for the HR profession over the long run.

1600

What it does is allow the human resources profession to advance in scope, in sophistication, in responsibility, and to meet challenges that are profession-wide that are going to carry it forward in the 21st century.

I think another intangible that it does is that it recognizes that in the kind of businesses that HR professionals serve and work in, in many cases the financial capital that they're dealing with is less financial capital, less physical capital such as plant and equipment, and more and more represents human capital—human capital where, in many cases, the most valuable assets that the organization has walk out the door at quitting time every day. If the place where your intellectual property resides, if the assets that add value to the organization are, in fact, the men and the women who drive it forward, then I think it makes the practice of human resources all that much more strategic to the organization's long-term best interests.

What we need in the 21st century are HR professionals who work within a framework of rules and regulations that, in most cases, they don't or can't get in their corporate environments. We need HR people to bring to the organization, to its stakeholders and to the people affected by what their organization or their employer does, the full range of expertise that they acquire as HR professionals, the expertise that they use in such areas as setting missions and goals, assisting in putting together a corporate strategy, measuring organizational effectiveness, matching staffing needs to what the available labour pool has, and sourcing strategic skills for the organization. We need HR people to know what it takes to retain key employees. We need HR people to come up with a fair framework of compensation, and not only that, but to come up with full and proper costing, both in the present tense and what the implications of actions are in the future. That's what good, competent HR people do. That's why we need this particular bill, because it's going to enable them to acquire the skills and to be able to market those skills.

For example, training and development—I used to work in the IT sector. One assumes that it takes between 10 and 20 days of professional development each year just to stay even in your field, and in most knowledge work today, that function of training, development, and employee retention is key.

So who actually manages that? In many cases, it's either managed or coordinated or runs through the HR department. That's what HR people do. If you've invested that much money in your people, you can't waste your people, your time and your money. You've got to advance them in sophistication, you've got to manage their skills, and you've got to keep them at the

cutting edge of whatever it is you do, if what it is you do requires an investment in human capital. That's what HR people do.

A good HR professional ensures, if you're in the business where your employees and their skills are what drives you forward, that you're getting the best possible value for your money. That money represents, for most organizations today, the most important investment that they make day after day after day.

I say, good for the HR Professionals Association. What they're providing for the profession are such functions as networking, leadership and management development. They allow a common body of standards and management of that all-important CHRP designation. They give people a forum to discuss their ideas, to share some of their thoughts, and basically, as HR professionals, to play a role in advancing their profession, their company, their skills, and the people whose careers they affect so deeply. What this act does is to assist the HR profession to manage its resources with the best possible tools and techniques, and to ensure that right here in Ontario and here in Canada, our organizations—organizations that members of the HR profession work in—manage human resources as effectively as we possibly can.

What this act does is give people that framework to go ahead and manage them. It addresses many of the gaps found in the current private statute. It has passed muster not only with independent legal opinion, but it is also considered to be the way to go by the members who practise HR now and will continue to practise HR as the decades evolve.

Speaker, I'm pleased to stand and to support this. It means a lot for HR people. It means a lot for the kind of businesses that we have today in Ontario. It's a measure that I urge all members to support. I do hope that it gets through committee and that it comes back to this House for third reading, where I hope all members will support it at third reading, make it law and assist the HR profession in the province of Ontario to go forward in the 21st century with modern standards and modern ways of managing its members and helping them do the best jobs they can in their careers, for their employers, for the people that they serve. Thank you very much, Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

The member for Willowdale has two minutes to reply.

**Mr. David Zimmer:** Thank you, Speaker. I think the endgame here is that in Ontario, we recognize that Ontario has a very complicated economy, a very sophisticated economy, whether it's high-tech, finance, education, real estate development, all of the enormous manufacturing challenges we're facing here in Ontario. It's those 8,000 organizations, those 8,000 businesses, that drive the Ontario economy, and their two million workers and the 20,000 HR professionals that work in that milieu, in that world.

One of the things that this government and all sides of this Legislature are driving away at, are trying to build, is

an economy that is attractive to everyone else in Canada so that they want to come here and do business, so that it's an economy that's attractive to international businesses, so that they want to come here. And what attracts business to Ontario? It's the quality of the lifestyle here. It's the quality of the workplace here. It's the quality of our health care system. It's the quality of our infrastructure. It's the quality of the conditions in which employers and employees, management, unions—where they all work together to build this economy.

A necessary tool to assist in that relationship to promote the very best working conditions is HR professionals. Anything we can do to enhance the profession is good for our economy, is good for the workplace, is good for the people of Ontario. That's why we should do everything we can to help human resource workers professionalize. The way we do that is to approve this legislation. Thank you, Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The time provided for private members' public business has expired.

#### COMMITTEE WITNESSES

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** We will deal first with ballot item number 13, standing in the name of Ms. Jones.

Ms. Jones has moved private member's notice of motion number 11. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*Motion agreed to.*

#### NORTHERN ONTARIO

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** We will deal with the motion by Mr. Vanthof.

Mr. Vanthof has moved private member's notice of motion number 9. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? I heard a no.

All those in favour of the motion, please say "aye."

All those opposed to the motion, please say "nay."

I'd say the ayes have it. The motion is carried.

*Motion agreed to.*

#### REGISTERED HUMAN RESOURCES PROFESSIONALS ACT, 2012

#### LOI DE 2012 SUR LES PROFESSIONNELLS EN RESSOURCES HUMAINES INSCRITS

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Mr. Zimmer has moved second reading of Bill 28. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*Second reading agreed to.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The bill is referred to the committee of the whole? Is that—

*Interjections.*

1610

**Mr. David Zimmer:** General government.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member wishes it to go to general government?

**Mr. David Zimmer:** Yes.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the bill be referred to general government?

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: Okay, I understand what happened here, but people should be paying attention, because there is a procedure for voting and there is a procedure in how we move things to committee. People need to pay attention; otherwise we end up in a spot. So I'm not going to get in a snit over it, but let's be very careful that we don't do that kind of stuff.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** All those in favour of the bill going to general government, please stand and remain standing.

**Mr. John O'Toole:** Which bill?

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Number 28.

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Can I have all members take a seat?

Sorry about the confusion, but the majority is in favour of the bill going to general government. So be it.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### ATTRACTING INVESTMENT AND CREATING JOBS ACT, 2012

#### LOI DE 2012 VISANT À ATTIRER LES INVESTISSEMENTS ET À CRÉER DES EMPLOIS

Resuming the debate adjourned on February 28, 2012, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 11, An Act respecting the continuation and establishment of development funds in order to promote regional economic development in eastern and southwestern Ontario / Projet de loi 11, Loi concernant la prorogation et la création de fonds de développement pour promouvoir le développement économique régional dans l'Est et le Sud-Ouest de l'Ontario.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate?

**M. Taras Natyshak:** Merci, monsieur le Président. Ça me donne grand plaisir aujourd'hui d'avoir la chance de parler de ce projet de loi, spécialement parce qu'on a la chance de parler à propos de quelque chose qui propose de toucher au sujet de la création d'emplois dans le sud-ouest de l'Ontario. Certainement, les membres dans cette Chambre ici savent comment le sujet de la création d'emplois dans le sud-ouest de l'Ontario est difficile.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Point of order, the member from Timmins—James Bay.

**M. Gilles Bisson:** Monsieur le Président, avec tout le langage à l'Assemblée, je ne peux pas entendre le député parler. S'il vous plaît, on peut baisser les voix un peu?

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Can I have order in the House? The member from Essex.

**M. Taras Natyshak:** Je remercie mon collègue pour son intervention.

It is indeed a pleasure to have the chance to speak to the bill before us, G11, the Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act. The overview of the bill provides the government—

*Interjections.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Order, please.

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** The bill provides the government with legal framework to continue the eastern Ontario development fund and create a new southwestern Ontario development fund to promote economic development in southwestern Ontario. And, of course, any of those members who are from southwestern Ontario can speak ad nauseam about the devastating effects that the most recent recession has had on southwestern Ontario jobs, on our manufacturing sector, on our agriculture sector, on a whole host of jobs that were traditionally strong and presented our region with measures of stability.

Mr. Speaker, in that light, we understand that the government wants to pay some credit, pay some attention to southwestern Ontario, but you know, my biggest concern is that—it's not necessarily the policy effectiveness of this bill, but yet the political manoeuvring. And so, you know, I've been around here for a little bit—

*Interjections.*

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** I'll talk to you guys. You're listening.

**Interjection:** We're listening.

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Thanks. Thank you.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** And the boys up there are listening too, as well. Thank you.

Well, I've been around for a couple of weeks here, and I'm getting the hang of it. I'm understanding—

*Applause.*

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Thank you. I'm understanding what it is exactly the motives are of, specifically, the government side, but in general, there are some ulterior motives when bills are presented. This one's pretty clear. It's as clear as mud. They attach a really catchy title to it, but yet it's a piecemeal approach. Let's get that straight right off the bat. It really, in terms of its effectiveness, in terms of generating job creation in southwestern Ontario, will do very little. I mean, you cannot take a piecemeal approach to the devastating effects of a global recession, a worldwide financial calamity, again—and I've said it many times—created and perpetuated by greed and mismanagement. I'll go through the "ations": deregulation, privatization, militarization—I'm starting to sound like Bob Dylan. But in fact, those are the reasons why we find ourselves in such a situation today.

Some may argue that, but I've lived it, because being from southwestern Ontario—the great riding of Essex, the agricultural heartland of our community and our

region—we did feed cities. The farmers in Essex county will tell you: Farmers feed cities each and every day. But what's interesting is that those farmers also, to be able to—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** I can tell.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Because he drives a big truck.

They also, these days, have to have good-paying jobs on the other end of the farm to be able to have their operations actually be sustainable. It wasn't like that in the past, Mr. Speaker. Farming and agricultural production was actually a decent living. You could actually scratch out a living in that, raise a family and contribute to your community, and serve that purpose, that really wholesome purpose that our agriculture and our rural community does in providing us with good, safe, sustainable sources of food.

But I regress to the act in front of us, which contains some measures that we have some trepidation about. One is that this fund is only \$20 million, and it may sound like a decent chunk of money, but for the entire region of southwestern Ontario, it's actually a pittance and will do little to stimulate growth and job creation. That is certainly our belief. If programs driven by the government side are any indication of its success, we really don't have that much confidence in its effectiveness.

Secondly, we're hesitant, we're concerned that this could become a slush fund. Oh, I see some heads popping up there, because that's a valid concern. We don't know where the government goes with their bills these days. We don't know what deals are brokered in the back rooms; we don't know what the intangibles may be; we don't know who's driving the programming, how much they're making. There are so many unknowns.

**Interjection:** Where are those slush funds going to go?

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Where are they going to go? We need to know, and that's one of our major concerns.

What we're saying is, give us some job guarantees. Provide the mechanisms, within the context of this bill, to have the checks and balances so that we don't get into another scenario such as the one that played out in Chatham, with Navistar, where they left that region, that community—1,100 jobs—bags of money in hand, and the community at a tremendous loss. We need to see real, hard job creation measures and real, hard commitments to those jobs. We need to also see, potentially, some punitive measures within this bill, such as some that exist in Minnesota, that would enable the government to claw back some of those funds if indeed we saw a progression toward layoffs and an exodus of those jobs.

1620

Another concern is that the monies to finance this program are being reallocated, so you are robbing Paul Miller to pay Peter—because we know the member has all the money in the world.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Peter Shurman.

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Peter Shurman; that's right.

But you're robbing Peter to pay Paul, and it really affects the bill and the effectiveness of that bill if you are watering down both measures in terms of their overall funding.

One of those bills is the strategic jobs and investment fund. The SJIF is a discretionary grant and loan program designed to support leading-edge investments in jobs in Ontario. It's something that I think has been fruitful, yet we're going to water that down because we're taking some money out of there to create the southwestern Ontario fund. We'd like to see stand-alone funding, of course, Mr. Speaker.

Also, unlike the northern Ontario heritage fund, there's no separate board, so this thing will have to go through ministerial approval. That's where the slush fund concerns come in, and I can tell you, meeting with stakeholders and specifically some folks who have some great ideas in my riding of Essex looking to take advantage of the strong workforce, the intelligent workforce, a manufacturing sector that built this country and those workers who are ready to go to work: They're ready to come in, but they're looking for approval from the ministry through the PPA, a power purchase agreement.

I challenge any member across the aisle to tell me how that works. Apply for a PPA. Try it. It's impossible. You will be mired in a bureaucracy that will spin your head around. That's the concern with this: that the accessibility of the funds will be solely at the minister's discretion, and of course, the ribbon-cutting ceremonies ensue, and it's a big party for the government.

We need some fairness. Certainly we need southwestern Ontario to be addressed and the job losses that we know have been incurred since the free trade agreement, NAFTA, and now what potentially could be CETA, which I believe the provincial government has given their stamp of approval on, despite concerns from municipalities that know this will affect their power to negotiate contracts, their power to release tenders, if they're at the whim and mercy of global forces.

Mr. Speaker, I forget to tell you that I am sharing my time with the member from London-Fanshawe. I will kindly give over the floor to her, and I'm sure she'll provide some great commentary.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I let the member finish his comments, but he referred to the southwestern Ontario development fund with what I think was unparliamentary language, and I would just like to ask him if he could withdraw that. I think it was not an appropriate use of a name for that fund.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** I'm sorry, I missed it, but I would leave it up to the member to withdraw if he—

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** I withdraw.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The member for London-Fanshawe.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Thank you, Speaker. I am grateful to have the opportunity today to discuss Bill 11,

the Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act for 2011.

My region where I come from is southwestern Ontario, and I am the MPP for London-Fanshawe. There's no doubt that southwestern Ontario has suffered its fair share of job losses over the years. I can specifically speak to my riding in London-Fanshawe, where we just had a very unfortunate incident, and I'll give you a little bit of history about it.

First of all, the people in my riding, and I'm sure in many other cities across Ontario and Canada, are very much worried about their jobs, keeping a job, job security, acquiring good jobs—not just temporary but permanent jobs with benefits.

That leads me to talk about the story I have with regard to my riding.

For 62 years, a company on Oxford Street was manufacturing locomotives. The workers at this location and at this company were asked to increase productivity by 20% last year, and they did.

Recently, record high profits were reported for this company in their fourth quarter. So if I worked there, I would have thought, "My company has been here for 62 years, we increased our production by 20% last year, as we were asked to do, and the company has filed record profits in their fourth quarter—more than they anticipated." Who wouldn't have thought: "What a great scenario for success for the company and success for the employee?"

**Mr. Jonah Schein:** You'd think they'd reinvest in London.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** You'd think they would reinvest in London, or keep investing in London.

The company I'm talking about, Speaker, is called Caterpillar. It has been across the news for the last few months, and many of us are familiar with the despicable behaviour of Caterpillar toward the situation. Around January 1 or 2, I believe, Caterpillar offered their workers a 50% cut to their wages and benefits. The workers were locked out. Ultimately, Caterpillar shut its doors.

I'm really concerned because, as I mentioned before, job losses are rampant across southern Ontario—over all of Ontario—and these good-paying jobs with benefits were held by people who were in my community and contributed to health care, to property taxes, to infrastructure, to having a meal in restaurants and creating those jobs. Suppliers of paint for the locomotives benefited from the company staying in the riding.

When I look at Bill 11, the Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act, it really makes me think that I don't want the example I have in my riding to happen again. This government needs to learn that when we give funds to companies, there have to be strings attached to those jobs.

I wanted to comment on the member from Essex's example of Navistar in his area. Navistar got money from the government, closed its doors and walked away with the investment they were supposed to make to keep jobs

here. It's a sad situation that that occurred, as it occurred in my riding.

When the member from Willowdale was speaking about the HR professionals motion, he said, "What is it that attracts companies to our city, to Ontario? The quality of life, good health care and infrastructure." The member from Mississauga—Streetsville, when he was speaking about the HR professionals bill, said, "What makes a good company, a strong company? Intellectual property."

Those were the two things that were taken from my community in London—Fanshawe. Quality of life for those workers—they can't contribute to the tax base, infrastructure and good health care—and the company took our intellectual property to Muncie, Indiana.

When we look at the bill today, the Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act, the first thing I want to point out, of course—what I just mentioned minutes ago and for the last little bit—is job guarantees. Unless this government is going to put clauses in their contract that we are not going to let our jobs walk away, I have a difficult time understanding how they can fund companies without those job guarantees, after what I experienced in my riding.

1630

The other thing that they are going to fund with the southwestern economic development fund is \$20 million. As my colleague from Windsor—Essex pointed out—

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Just Essex.

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** Excuse me. As my colleague from Essex pointed out, this money is not new-found money. This money will be reallocated from a different fund which is known as the job strategic investment fund, I think it is. This is a successful program, and they're going to take money from that program to help the southwestern economic development fund.

I'm all for helping. I'm all for sharing and compromising and getting the job done, but if it's not going to be a dent in the job market that we have in my riding of London, as an example, if it's only a drop in the bucket, what are you saying to those people who are looking for jobs every day? Are you really helping the situation, or is it just maybe an act?

Many people refer to it in the House, of the Liberals wanting to look like they're doing something, but it's not enough. It's a little thing. It needs to be substantial. It needs to make people's lives—as the member from Willowdale said, a quality of life with good health care and infrastructure. That's what we need to be done with this bill. We need to make sure that we are looking after those good jobs that are coming to London, to Ontario, and we're going to keep them here with strings attached and job guarantees, whatever it takes, so that we can help the citizens of Ontario.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Questions and comments?

Further debate?

**M. Gilles Bisson:** Merci beaucoup, monsieur le Président. Votre vigilance sur le fauteuil du Président est très appréciée.

Je veux commencer par dire, monsieur le Président et membres de l'Assemblée, que ce projet de loi, tel qu'on l'a décrit dans nos discours jusqu'à date—que le parti NDP, sous le leadership de M<sup>me</sup> Horwath, est en faveur. On pense que l'idée est bonne. On a besoin de mettre en place un fonds de développement économique pour des régions comme le Sud-Ouest et le Sud-Est, et c'est quelque chose dont on a grandement besoin dans ces communautés.

Justement, on a rencontré les dirigeants des communautés, des maires et des conseillers de l'est et du sud-ouest de l'Ontario, à la conférence qu'on vient juste d'avoir ici pour les municipalités, et tout le monde parle de l'importance.

But I've got to say that although we support this, there is, I think, a change that needs to be made.

I come from a place in northern Ontario—and my good friend John Vanthof referred to it earlier in his debate in regard to the creation of the northern Ontario committee that passed on a voice vote today, and we're quite appreciative of that. We look forward to the next step of actually forming this committee—is the issue of the Northern Ontario Heritage Fund Corp., or NOHFC, as it's known, which is our regional economic development organization, something as proposed in southwestern and southeastern Ontario. But the difference is, we run our own NOHFC. The minister or the crown appoints people from across northern Ontario to sit on the commission, as it's called, and they make the decisions at the board level as to what the policies of that committee should be and what kinds of projects should or shouldn't be approved. Of course, the chair, being the minister, has a great say about what he or she wants that particular fund to do, but all of the review of applications and the final decisions on applications are made by people in northern Ontario who live and breathe the experience of the projects that we see come before the commission.

I myself would prefer that the NOHFC be a fund entirely dedicated to economic development. Currently, it does a couple of other things which I think are okay, but those things are better done under actual line ministries with capital dollars to do those things. But the idea of having an economic development fund has been crucial to the survival of many an industry in northern Ontario. The way it works is that we have a number of different programs. For example, a company that's trying to do a new start-up is looking for financing but they don't have enough money in order to be able to make the bank comfortable enough to make the loan—sometimes it could be a \$200,000 project, it could be a \$2-million project. They get before the bank, and the bank says, "Sorry; you don't have enough equity in order for us to lend you the money." You're able to go to the NOHFC, and the NOHFC could do a loan guarantee for you—in fact, we make money with NOHFC because people actually pay their loans back—or you can give a

loan/grant situation, where the person does a loan, and part of it is granted and part of it is a guarantee. There are different ways of doing it. There have been different combinations. The point is, it has been crucial for lots of businesses in northern Ontario to do those new start-ups because often they don't have access to capital.

One of the things that we recognize in the north—and I would imagine it's the same in southwestern and southeastern Ontario: You don't have access to capital as you do in a place like Toronto. Toronto has all kinds of investors. You can go knock on their doors; you can ask them for the money. It's a lot easier to raise capital for projects in an urban setting. But when you're in Kenora or Kingston or wherever it might be, it's a lot harder to be able to raise capital.

NOHFC has this board, and it's the board that decides. We've had plenty of start-ups in northern Ontario as a result of the NOHFC, and more importantly, we've had many industries that have been saved as a result of the interventions of NOHFC.

To say that all of the loans and grants that were given by NOHFC have all been paid—we're like any other lender. There's always a certain amount of default. But here's a number. The last time I looked at it, which was a number of years ago, the amount of money that we collect back, plus interest, on the guarantee side of the operation—actually, we make money with it. We actually build up a little bit of money to allow us to do some interesting things.

I remember when we were in government and I was parliamentary assistant to Northern Development and Mines Minister Shelley Martel and eventually to Gilles Pouliot. We, I remember, at that time were stuck with a really wonderful problem. The loans had been paid back and the money that we had been granted at that time—\$50 million a year—had actually grown to about \$120 million, plus their \$50 million, because people had paid their loans back. So we were able to sit down and look at, what can we do to target Algoma Steel? I remember that we did some work with them. We did work with Abitibi—I remember doing some work with Abitibi out of Iroquois Falls—and a whole bunch of other industries that were able to invest and retool and put themselves in a position of being more efficient, to keep their doors open.

If that's what we're creating in southwestern and southeastern Ontario, I think it's a good idea. However, what I see in the legislation proposed is the creation of a fund but not of that board that is able to make the decisions about who gets the money and what the policy of the loans and grant and guarantees should be.

I am looking forward to going into committee so that we actually can have the discussion, engage with the people of the southwest, engage with the people of the southeast, and say, "Should we model this fund something like an NOHFC?" I'm hopeful that if we get to committee—which we will—we will be able to bring forward amendments that will be able to do that.

I look forward to the participation of all of the members of the House in this particular bill and I look forward to it being the bill that it can be. I think that would strengthen very much what the government is trying to do, and I think it would give the people of the southwest and southeast a sense, as we have in the north, at least with one thing: that they have some control over their own economic development agency.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Questions and comments?

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** I always enjoy hearing the member speak because of his long experience in this House and his ability to be concise in finding the appropriate parts of the bill to support and to point out any weaknesses that might be in the legislation.

I may be hearing what I want to hear, but I detected some degree of support in general for the legislation, but a desire, as we would all want to see, for it to enjoy the kind of scrutiny that legislation should receive within committees of the Ontario Legislature—the appropriate committee of the House. Often, we're able to have people come in to speak to it, to tell us how the legislation can be improved; or, if they think it's perfect, they can tell us that. That's seldom the case. It also allows an opportunity for members to ask the appropriate questions of the government who is proposing the legislation.

Of course, in committee, when we deal with clause-by-clause of bills of this kind, again, there are proposals put forward, amendments, from time to time. Sometimes the government will put in its own amendments. Often, it will react to something that it has heard in the committee, or members of the opposition may offer amendments they feel would strengthen the bill.

1640

I think the debate has been good on this bill. There's not total agreement in the House. That's natural in any one of these circumstances. There's a philosophical difference in one situation. I think in the other situation it's probably a difference more in the details of the bill and looking to ensure that the bill can be positive for the people of Ontario.

I know that my friend and your friend, Gilles, Senator Runciman would be watching this debate. My guess would be Senator Runciman would be enthusiastic about this piece of legislation.

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I just think it would be out of order if we did not recognize Mr. Joe Rotman, a great Canadian who I know is a friend to members of this House and who not only lends his name but whose leadership and generosity established the Ontario Brain Institute and much of our research at university facilities. I want to thank him for his great citizenship, his leadership, and his friendship to this government and to the opposition and to all Ontarians. He's a great, great Canadian.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Thank you and welcome, but as the member knows, it's not a point of order.

Questions and comments?

**Mr. Monte Kwinter:** Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to comment on the comments from the member from Timmins–James Bay.

When I was the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, we had these development funds, and they did a terrific job. I remember going to estimates, and when I was at the estimates, some of the members were critical of the fact that the fund had a loss of 4% on their investments, as opposed to the chartered banks, which were about 1%. They asked, why can't you match what the chartered banks are doing with this money?

We finally determined that that wasn't the role of the development fund, to replace the banks. They were to provide funds for those people who couldn't get money from the banks, and it was worth the premium in the losses to get those others going and get the development going and create the jobs.

So that was a real testimony to what this fund is for. It is not meant to augment or supplement the banks; it's for people who can't get them but have a prospect of being very successful and creating the jobs that are intended under this legislation.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Further debate? Mr. Bisson, you have two minutes to reply.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Mr. Speaker, I don't plan to take two minutes. I just want to hearken back to a subject my good friend Mr. Bradley and I have talked about a number of times, and that is hearken back to the time when committees actually did work in this place. We both came to this place—you obviously long before me by about 10 years, but I remember coming here some 22 years ago. You would sit in committee, and you actually did have the sort of congeniality that you needed. Government, yes, did some ideological things, and those things happened, but by and large, you tried to work together to do what is was right for the people of Ontario.

Hopefully, that's what this minority Parliament is going to deliver. Certainly, that's what Andrea Horwath

and New Democrats are trying to do by way of our actions. It's not always easy for government to see what we're trying to do, but effectively what we're trying to do today in the end is what's right for the people of Ontario. That's what we're sent here for.

And I really respect the member for—Jim Bradley.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Mr. Milloy has moved second reading of Bill 11, An Act respecting the continuation and establishment of development funds in order to promote regional economic development in eastern and southwestern Ontario.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

I heard a no.

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

The ayes have it in my opinion.

Call in the members. This will be a 30-minute bell.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Mr. Speaker, I can help you out here.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** I have a motion here: "Pursuant to standing order 28(h), I request that the vote on the motion by Minister Milloy be deferred until Monday, March 5, following question period."

Is it the pleasure of the House? Carried.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** There's no pleasure. This is just the right of the government.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Okay.

*Second reading vote deferred.*

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** Orders of the day.

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** I move adjournment of the House.

**The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon):** The government House leader has moved adjournment of the House. All in favour? Carried.

This House stands adjourned until Monday at 10:30.

*The House adjourned at 1646.*

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: Hon. / L'hon. David C. Onley, O.Ont.  
Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Dave Levac  
Clerk / Greffière: Deborah Deller  
Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman, Tonia Grannum  
Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Albanese, Laura (LIB)	York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston	
Armstrong, Teresa J. (NDP)	London–Fanshawe	
Arnott, Ted (PC)	Wellington–Halton Hills	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée
Bailey, Robert (PC)	Sarnia–Lambton	
Balkissoon, Bas (LIB)	Scarborough–Rouge River	Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée Deputy Speaker / Vice-président
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand–Norfolk	
Bartolucci, Hon. / L'hon. Rick (LIB)	Sudbury	Chair of Cabinet / Président du Conseil des ministres Minister of Northern Development and Mines / Ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie
Bentley, Hon. / L'hon. Christopher (LIB)	London West / London-Ouest	
Berardinetti, Lorenzo (LIB)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	
Best, Hon. / L'hon. Margaret R. (LIB)	Scarborough–Guildwood	Minister of Consumer Services / Ministre des Services aux consommateurs
Bisson, Gilles (NDP)	Timmins–James Bay / Timmins–Baie James	House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire de parti reconnu
Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (LIB)	St. Catharines	Minister of the Environment / Ministre de l'Environnement Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
Brotten, Hon. / L'hon. Laurel C. (LIB)	Etobicoke–Lakeshore	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation Minister Responsible for Women's Issues / Ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Campbell, Sarah (NDP)	Kenora–Rainy River	
Cansfield, Donna H. (LIB)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	
Chan, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)	Markham–Unionville	Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport / Ministre de Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport
Chiarelli, Hon. / L'hon. Bob (LIB)	Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Minister of Infrastructure / Ministre de l'Infrastructure Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Halton	
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds–Grenville	
Colle, Mike (LIB)	Eglinton–Lawrence	
Coteau, Michael (LIB)	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	
Crack, Grant (LIB)	Glengarry–Prescott–Russell	
Craiton, Kim (LIB)	Niagara Falls	
Damerla, Dipika (LIB)	Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville	
Delaney, Bob (LIB)	Mississauga–Streetsville	
Dhillon, Vic (LIB)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Dickson, Joe (LIB)	Ajax–Pickering	
DiNovo, Cheri (NDP)	Parkdale–High Park	
Duguid, Hon. / L'hon. Brad (LIB)	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Minister of Economic Development and Innovation / Ministre du Développement économique et de l'Innovation Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / Président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement Deputy Premier / Vice-premier ministre
Duncan, Hon. / L'hon. Dwight (LIB)	Windsor–Tecumseh	Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances
Dunlop, Garfield (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	
Elliott, Christine (PC)	Whitby–Oshawa	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Fedeli, Victor (PC)	Nipissing	Deputy House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire adjointe de parti reconnu
Flynn, Kevin Daniel (LIB)	Oakville	
Forster, Cindy (NDP)	Welland	
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	Attorney General / Procureur général
<b>Gerretsen, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles	
<b>Gravelle, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Thunder Bay–Superior North / Thunder Bay–Superior-Nord	
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	Minister of Natural Resources / Ministre des Richesses naturelles
Harris, Michael (PC)	Kitchener–Conestoga	
Hillier, Randy (PC)	Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington	
Horwath, Andrea (NDP)	Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre	Leader, Recognized Party / Chef de parti reconnu
<b>Hoskins, Hon. / L'hon. Eric (LIB)</b>	St. Paul's	Leader, New Democratic Party of Ontario / Chef du Nouveau parti démocratique de l'Ontario
		Minister of Children and Youth Services / Ministre des Services à l'enfance et à la jeunesse
		Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail
Hudak, Tim (PC)	Niagara West–Glanbrook / Niagara-Ouest–Glanbrook	Minister Responsible for Seniors / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires des personnes âgées
Jackson, Rod (PC)	Barrie	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Jaczek, Helena (LIB)	Oak Ridges–Markham	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Jeffrey, Hon. / L'hon. Linda (LIB)</b>	Brampton–Springdale	
Jones, Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin–Caledon	
Klees, Frank (PC)	Newmarket–Aurora	Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / Ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Kwinter, Monte (LIB)	York Centre / York-Centre	
Leal, Jeff (LIB)	Peterborough	
Leone, Rob (PC)	Cambridge	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales
<b>Levac, Hon. / L'hon. Dave (LIB)</b>	Brant	
MacCharles, Tracy (LIB)	Pickering–Scarborough East / Pickering–Scarborough-Est	
MacLaren, Jack (PC)	Carleton–Mississippi Mills	Premier / Premier ministre
MacLeod, Lisa (PC)	Nepean–Carleton	Leader, Government / Chef du gouvernement
Mangat, Amrit (LIB)	Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud	Leader, Liberal Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti libéral de l'Ontario
Mantha, Michael (NDP)	Algoma–Manitoulin	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
Marchese, Rosario (NDP)	Trinity–Spadina	
<b>Matthews, Hon. / L'hon. Deborah (LIB)</b>	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	
Mauro, Bill (LIB)	Thunder Bay–Atikokan	Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / Ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels
McDonell, Jim (PC)	Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry	
<b>McGuinty, Hon. / L'hon. Dalton (LIB)</b>	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	
McKenna, Jane (PC)	Burlington	Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones
<b>McMeekin, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (LIB)</b>	Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough–Westdale	
McNaughton, Monte (PC)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	
McNeely, Phil (LIB)	Ottawa–Orléans	Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (LIB)</b>	Ottawa–Vanier	
Miller, Norm (PC)	Parry Sound–Muskoka	
<b>Miller, Paul (NDP)</b>	Hamilton East–Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est–Stoney Creek	

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Milligan, Rob E. (PC)	Northumberland—Quinte West	Minister of Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement
<b>Milloy, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	
Moridi, Reza (LIB)	Richmond Hill	
<b>Munro, Julia (PC)</b>	York—Simcoe	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Murray, Hon. / L'hon. Glen R. (LIB)</b>	Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Naqvi, Yasir (LIB)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration / Ministre des Affaires civiques et de l'Immigration
Natyshak, Taras (NDP)	Essex	
Nicholls, Rick (PC)	Chatham—Kent—Essex	
O'Toole, John (PC)	Durham	
Oraziotti, David (LIB)	Sault Ste. Marie	
Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Oshawa	
Pettapiece, Randy (PC)	Perth—Wellington	
Piruzza, Teresa (LIB)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	
Prue, Michael (NDP)	Beaches—East York	
Qaadri, Shafiq (LIB)	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	
Sandals, Liz (LIB)	Guelph	
Schein, Jonah (NDP)	Davenport	
Scott, Laurie (PC)	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	
Sergio, Mario (LIB)	York West / York-Ouest	
Shurman, Peter (PC)	Thornhill	
Singh, Jagmeet (NDP)	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	
Smith, Todd (PC)	Prince Edward—Hastings	
Sorbara, Greg (LIB)	Vaughan	
<b>Sousa, Hon. / L'hon. Charles (LIB)</b>	Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud	
Tabuns, Peter (NDP)	Toronto—Danforth	Minister of Government Services / Ministre des Services gouvernementaux
<b>Takhar, Hon. / L'hon. Harinder S. (LIB)</b>	Mississauga—Erindale	
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle
Thompson, Lisa M. (PC)	Huron—Bruce	
Vanthof, John (NDP)	Timiskaming—Cochrane	
Walker, Bill (PC)	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	
Wilson, Jim (PC)	Simcoe—Grey	
Witmer, Elizabeth (PC)	Kitchener—Waterloo	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Wong, Soo (LIB)	Scarborough—Agincourt	
<b>Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (LIB)</b>	Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	
Yakabuski, John (PC)	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	
Yurek, Jeff (PC)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	
Zimmer, David (LIB)	Willowdale	

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Standing Committee on Estimates / Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses**

Chair / Président: Michael Prue  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Taras Natyshak  
Grant Crack, Kim Craitor  
Vic Dhillon, Michael Harris  
Rob Leone, Taras Natyshak  
Rick Nicholls, Michael Prue  
Mario Sergio  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs /  
Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Bob Delaney  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Teresa Piruzza  
Bob Delaney, Victor Fedeli  
Cindy Forster, Monte McNaughton  
Yasir Naqvi, Teresa Piruzza  
Michael Prue, Peter Shurman  
Soo Wong  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on General Government / Comité  
permanent des affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: David Orazietti  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: David Zimmer  
Sarah Campbell, Michael Coteau  
Joe Dickson, Rosario Marchese  
David Orazietti, Laurie Scott  
Todd Smith, Jeff Yurek  
David Zimmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przewdziecki

**Standing Committee on Government Agencies / Comité  
permanent des organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Donna H. Cansfield, Helena Jaczek  
Bill Mauro, Jim McDonell  
Phil McNeely, Randy Pettapiece  
Peter Tabuns, Monique Taylor  
Lisa M. Thompson  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Justice Policy / Comité permanent de  
la justice**

Chair / Présidente: Laura Albanese  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Shafiq Qaadri  
Laura Albanese, Teresa J. Armstrong  
Lorenzo Berardinetti, Mike Colle  
Frank Klees, Jack MacLaren  
Paul Miller, Rob E. Milligan  
Shafiq Qaadri  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly / Comité  
permanent de l'Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: Garfield Dunlop  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Lisa MacLeod  
Laura Albanese, Bas Balkissoon  
Gilles Bisson, Donna H. Cansfield  
Steve Clark, Garfield Dunlop  
Jeff Leal, Lisa MacLeod  
Jonah Schein  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts / Comité permanent  
des comptes publics**

Chair / Président: Norm Miller  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Toby Barrett  
Toby Barrett, France Gélinas  
Phil McNeely, Norm Miller  
Reza Moridi, Jerry J. Ouellette  
Liz Sandals, Jagmeet Singh  
David Zimmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills / Comité  
permanent des règlements et des projets de loi d'intérêt privé**

Chair / Président: Peter Tabuns  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: John Vanthof  
Michael Coteau, Grant Crack  
Vic Dhillon, Randy Hillier  
Rod Jackson, Mario Sergio  
Peter Tabuns, John Vanthof  
Bill Walker  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Tamara Pomanski

**Standing Committee on Social Policy / Comité permanent de  
la politique sociale**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Ted Chudleigh, Dipika Damerla  
Cheri DiNovo, Kevin Daniel Flynn  
Ernie Hardeman, Tracy MacCharles  
Amrit Mangat, Michael Mantha  
Jane McKenna  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS / DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

<b>Valleys 2000</b>	
Mr. John O'Toole.....	797
<b>Riding of London-Fanshawe</b>	
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong.....	798
<b>Peter Adams</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal.....	798
<b>Rail accident</b>	
Mrs. Jane McKenna.....	798
<b>Fire safety</b>	
Mr. Gilles Bisson.....	799
<b>Government's record</b>	
Mr. Mike Colle.....	799
<b>Premier's comments</b>	
Mr. Ted Arnett.....	799
<b>Cancer colorectal / Colorectal cancer</b>	
M. Shafiq Qaadri.....	799
<b>Accountability</b>	
Mr. Rod Jackson.....	800
<b>Visitors</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal.....	800
<b>Correction of record</b>	
Mr. John O'Toole.....	800
<b>Visitors</b>	
Ms. Tracy MacCharles.....	800

## PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS

<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. John O'Toole.....	800
<b>Kidney disease</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal.....	801
<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. Jim McDonell.....	801
<b>Dog ownership</b>	
Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....	801
<b>Kidney disease</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal.....	801
<b>Rural schools</b>	
Mr. Jim Wilson.....	801
<b>Renewable energy</b>	
Mr. Rod Jackson.....	802

<b>Kidney disease</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal.....	802
<b>Renewable energy</b>	
Mr. Jeff Yurek.....	802
<b>Renewable energy</b>	
Mr. John O'Toole.....	802
<b>Diagnostic services</b>	
Mme France Gélinas.....	803
<b>Kidney disease</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal.....	803
<b>Renewable energy</b>	
Mr. Jeff Yurek.....	803
<b>Correction of record</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal.....	803
<b>Member for Ottawa Centre</b>	
Hon. Glen R. Murray.....	803
<b>Visitors</b>	
Mr. Mike Colle.....	804
<b>Committee witnesses</b>	
The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bas Balkissoon).....	804

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS / AFFAIRES D'INTÉRÊT PUBLIC ÉMANANT DES DÉPUTÉS

<b>Committee witnesses</b>	
Ms. Sylvia Jones.....	804
Mr. Gilles Bisson.....	806
Mr. David Zimmer.....	808
Mr. Rob Leone.....	809
Mr. Bob Delaney.....	810
Mr. Rob E. Milligan.....	810
Mr. Jeff Yurek.....	811
Mr. John O'Toole.....	811
Ms. Sylvia Jones.....	811
<b>Northern Ontario</b>	
Mr. John Vanthof.....	812
Mrs. Liz Sandals.....	814
Mr. Norm Miller.....	815
Ms. Andrea Horwath.....	815
Mr. Jeff Leal.....	816
Mr. Victor Fedeli.....	817
Ms. Sarah Campbell.....	817
Mr. John Yakabuski.....	818
Mr. Michael Mantha.....	818
Mme France Gélinas.....	818
Mr. John Vanthof.....	819

## ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

<b>Registered Human Resources Professionals Act, 2012, Bill 28, Mr. Zimmer, Mr. Prue, Mrs. Elliott / Loi de 2012 sur les professionnels en ressources humaines inscrits, projet de loi 28, M. Zimmer, M. Prue, Mme. Elliott</b>	
Mr. David Zimmer.....	819
Mrs. Christine Elliott .....	821
Mr. Michael Prue .....	822
Mr. Bob Delaney .....	824
Mr. David Zimmer.....	825
<b>Committee witnesses</b>	
Motion agreed to .....	826
<b>Northern Ontario</b>	
Motion agreed to .....	826
<b>Registered Human Resources Professionals Act, 2012, Bill 28, Mr. Zimmer, Mr. Prue, Mrs. Elliott / Loi de 2012 sur les professionnels en ressources humaines inscrits, projet de loi 28, M. Zimmer, M. Prue, Mme. Elliott</b>	
Second reading agreed to .....	826

## ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

<b>Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act, 2012, Bill 11, Mr. Duguid / Loi de 2012 visant à attirer les investissements et à créer des emplois, projet de loi 11, M. Duguid</b>	
M. Taras Natyshak.....	826
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong.....	828
M. Gilles Bisson .....	829
Hon. James J. Bradley .....	830
Mr. Monte Kwinter.....	831
Mr. Gilles Bisson .....	831
Second reading vote deferred .....	831

# CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Thursday 1 March 2012 / Jeudi 1<sup>er</sup> mars 2012

## ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

### Security for Courts, Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012, Bill 34, Mrs. Meilleur / Loi de 2012 sur la sécurité des tribunaux, des centrales électriques et des installations nucléaires, projet de loi 34,

Mme Meilleur

Mr. Taras Natyshak .....	777
Mr. Jagmeet Singh .....	782
Hon. Glen R. Murray .....	785
Mr. John O'Toole .....	786
Mr. Rosario Marchese .....	786
Mr. Jeff Leal .....	786
Mr. Jagmeet Singh .....	787
Second reading debate deemed adjourned .....	787

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Mr. Garfield Dunlop .....	787
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	787
Mr. Jim McDonell .....	787
Hon. Charles Sousa .....	787
Mr. Jerry J. Ouellette .....	787
Mr. Yasir Naqvi .....	787
Ms. Laurie Scott .....	787
Mme France Gélinas .....	787
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	787
Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer .....	787
Mr. Yasir Naqvi .....	788
The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac) .....	788

## ORAL QUESTIONS / QUESTIONS ORALES

### Air ambulance service

Mr. Frank Klees .....	788
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	788

### Air ambulance service

Mr. Frank Klees .....	788
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	789

### Air ambulance service

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	789
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	789

### Air ambulance service

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	790
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	790

## Whistle-blower protection

Ms. Sylvia Jones .....	791
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	791

## Air ambulance service

Mr. Taras Natyshak .....	791
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	792

## Post-secondary education

Mr. Yasir Naqvi .....	792
Hon. Glen R. Murray .....	792

## Air ambulance service

Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer .....	792
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	792

## Air ambulance service

Mme France Gélinas .....	793
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	793

## Nurses

Mr. Grant Crack .....	793
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	793

## Air ambulance service

Mrs. Christine Elliott .....	794
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	794

## Youth services

Miss Monique Taylor .....	794
Hon. Eric Hoskins .....	794

## Correctional services

Mr. David Zimmer .....	795
Hon. Madeleine Meilleur .....	795

## Air ambulance service

Mrs. Jane McKenna .....	795
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	796

## Nurse practitioners

Mme France Gélinas .....	796
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	796

## Water quality

Mrs. Teresa Piruzza .....	796
Hon. James J. Bradley .....	797

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Mr. John O'Toole .....	797
Ms. Tracy MacCharles .....	797

*Continued on inside back cover*



No. 20

N° 20

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

First Session, 40<sup>th</sup> Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 40<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Monday 5 March 2012**

**Lundi 5 mars 2012**



**Speaker**  
Honourable Dave Levac

**Président**  
L'honorable Dave Levac

**Clerk**  
Deborah Deller

**Greffière**  
Deborah Deller

### **Hansard on the Internet**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

### **Le Journal des débats sur Internet**

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

### **Renseignements sur l'index**

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.

---

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services  
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building  
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park  
Toronto ON M7A 1A2  
Telephone 416-325-7400; fax 416-325-7430  
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service du Journal des débats et d'interprétation  
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement  
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park  
Toronto ON M7A 1A2  
Téléphone, 416-325-7400; télécopieur, 416-325-7430  
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 5 March 2012

## ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lundi 5 mars 2012

*The House met at 1030.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Please join us in prayer.

*Prayers.*

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Mr. Monte McNaughton:** I would like to welcome back to this Legislature my wife, Kate Bartz, and our family friend and former page of the Legislature, Anthony Boland. Welcome.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further introductions? The member from—Timmins—James Bay.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** There is no way I'm going to tell you, Speaker; no way I'm going to tell you.

I'd like to welcome our guests who are just arriving from the CAA. They're here today on their lobby day, and they're meeting with members from all three political parties to talk about the importance of road safety and other issues. Welcome to the assembly.

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** It's my pleasure to introduce representatives from the Canadian Automobile Association's three Ontario clubs, collectively representing over 2.2 million Ontarians. The CAA is here today as part of their advocacy day. Guests include president and CEO Nick Parks and chair Dina Palozzi from CAA South Central Ontario, president Tim Georgeoff and chair Frances Mannarino from CAA North and East Ontario, and president Pat Nielsen and chair Bruno Iafrate from CAA Niagara. Please welcome them to Queen's Park.

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** It's my pleasure to introduce the Automotive Industries Association of Canada, including president Marc Brazeau and manager of policy and communications Jason Kerr, here promoting their Be Car Care Aware campaign. They're joined by some of their members who are leaders in the aftermarket automotive industry, an \$18.2-billion industry that employs more than 420,200 Canadians. I'd like to welcome them to the Legislature today.

**Mr. Reza Moridi:** It's my pleasure to introduce Ms. Vijaya Narayan, mother of page Kriti Ravindran, from Richmond Hill, sitting in the public gallery here.

**Hon. Glen R. Murray:** We have a guest in the House today all the way from Uganda. Adrian Jjuuko is a human rights lawyer. He is here with York University. This is a very courageous young man who is not gay, who is a lawyer and a human rights activist in Uganda. Within the next month or 60 days a law will likely be

introduced in the Uganda Legislature making being gay or lesbian subject to the death penalty or being HIV-positive subject to the death penalty. Adrian is here with my friend Doug Elliott. I would like you to recognize him.

There are many reasons I'm a little emotional, Speaker. To be a friend of the gay and lesbian community, Adrian is risking personal death and at least seven years in prison simply for speaking out on behalf of gay and lesbian human rights. As you know, many gay and lesbian people have been beaten and killed.

**Mr. Kim Craiton:** I'm really pleased to introduce Rick Mauro. He's the vice-president of marketing and public relations for CAA Niagara from the great riding of Niagara Falls.

**Mr. Bob Delaney:** On behalf of my colleague the member from Brampton West, I'm pleased to recognize a group from Nigeria Customs attending the Canadian Training Institute in Brampton. I'm pleased to introduce, in the members' east gallery, instructor Samuel Amoah and Lesley Anne Amoah, Mustapha Mohammed Munir, Nuruddeen Musa, Birdling Bubwa Abasiryu, Njoku Emmanuel Ifeanyi, Ayawa Danladi, Heme Howell Ndukwe, Chibuike Chinaka and Awogbemi Petson Olanrewaju. Please welcome them to the Ontario Legislative Assembly.

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** I'd like to introduce to the House—they were here briefly, and I think they might have stepped out—the family of page Sophia: mother, Jakai Shwe; father, Sai Shwe; and sister, Grace. They're all here to see page Sophia, so I'd like to welcome them.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further introductions?

We have two introductions in the Speaker's gallery. We have in the Speaker's gallery someone who is probably going to take notes about how well I do, former Speaker David Warner, the former MPP from Scarborough—Ellesmere in the 30th, 31st, 33rd and 35th Parliaments, and Speaker from 1990 to 1995. Welcome.

### 1040

As well, we have with us today in the Speaker's gallery the ambassador of the Portuguese republic to Canada, His Excellency Pedro Moitinho de Almeida, accompanied by the consul general of Portugal to Toronto, Mr. Júlio Vilela. We welcome them with warm feelings. Thank you very much, gentlemen, for being here.

It is now time for oral questions.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Thank you, Speaker; my question is to the Deputy Premier.

Any good jobs strategy, a jobs plan, will involve reliable and affordable energy in the province of Ontario. The McGuinty government has taken us down a very expensive path in the feed-in tariff program that is driving up our rates. In fact, you've created a bit of a gold rush, with tens of thousands of applications already in the kitty for these expensive subsidies, and you're going to continue down that path.

Deputy Premier, given that every other country that tried this, even 10 years ago, is backing away or ending these programs altogether, if we want to create jobs in Ontario, shouldn't we do the same and have reliable and affordable energy to attract investment and job creation here?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** To the Minister of Energy.

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** I thank the leader for the question. We are committed to clean energy, to clean energy jobs and to reliable power. Over the last eight years, the people of the province of Ontario have done a lot of work fixing a power system that was left in some state of disrepair, bringing on new generation and eliminating coal, which, although it looks cheap, is very, very expensive and bad for the health of the province of Ontario.

We're committed to a reliable system, a clean system and an affordable system, and we're committed to the opportunities that clean, green energy jobs present for the people of the province of Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Back, then, to the minister, Speaker. Minister, as our energy rates have gone up, our job creation has gone in the opposite direction. The higher the energy rates, the less attractive Ontario is for investment and job creation; the things are obviously very related.

So I think it's important now to take a step back, to pause and to chart a different course to reliable, affordable energy that will help create jobs in the province again; to make us robust in job creation, not at the back of the pack. The important part of doing this, when you look at the Auditor General's report, for example, is to end your feed-in tariff program that is driving up rates.

Let me ask you, Minister, directly: Will you end this feed-in tariff program that Ontario families simply can't afford?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** No. We are committed to clean energy. We're committed to clean energy jobs. In the last two years, we have over 20,000 jobs in the province of Ontario, we have over \$27 billion of investment that's come in to support those jobs and jobs to come, and in the course of developing clean, green energy, we're saving the lives and the health of thousands of Ontarians and we're getting out of the 18th-century technology that the party opposite seems to be committed

to. Coal does not have a future in the health or the lives of the people of this province. Clean, green energy does, and I'd call upon the leader opposite to support clean air, clean energy and the thousands of jobs that go with it.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Back to the minister: It is disappointing that on a very serious policy issue, the minister engages in these specious arguments that aren't related to the matter at hand.

Your program has become increasingly expensive. There was a devastating report by the Auditor General this past December that indicated, for the jobs that you brag about, he felt that three quarters were in fact not full-time, permanent jobs, as you argue. In fact, the Auditor General says that for every job you create through big subsidies, you lose two to four jobs in the broader economy.

Minister, the answer, when you're heading down the wrong road and over a cliff with higher energy prices, is not to simply slow down; the answer should be to turn the car around, head in the opposite direction to make Ontario open for investment again.

Minister, I'll press: Will you do the right thing and support a private member's bill that I'll bring in to end the feed-in tariff program that is chasing jobs out of the province?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** Speaker, no matter where you go in this province, you can see those jobs. I was in Welland just the other week at OSM Solar. OSM Solar has come out of an old plant that closed years ago.

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order. It's Monday morning. Thank you.

Minister?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** OSM Solar has come out of a facility that was closed years ago. It has 60 workers now; they're targeting for 100. It doesn't matter where you go in this province. You see the people who are manufacturing. You see the businesses that support the manufacturing. You see the investments through steel, whether they're electricians or plumbers. There are over 20,000. We're going to 50,000. Why won't the member support the jobs and apprentices that he talks so much about—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Back to the Deputy Premier: An important thing happened on Thursday last week where my colleague the member from Newmarket-Aurora, Mr. Klees, and the member for Nickel Belt, Ms. Gélinas, brought forward a bipartisan effort to get to the bottom of the Ornge scandal, and I congratulate those members on working together to address this important issue.

The health minister seemed to indicate that she would support such a select committee to get to the bottom of

the Ornge scandal. Speaking in your capacity as Deputy Premier, will you support the call standing in the name of Mr. Klees and Ms. Gólinas?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** The Minister of Health.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you for the question. Once again, my answer remains the same as it was on Thursday. If it is the will of this Legislature that there be a select committee—I would not presume the will of the Legislature—I will, of course, be fully supportive of that.

There will be, for sure, opportunities for the Legislature to have robust conversations about Ornge. I suspect public accounts will want to have this conversation, as will the committee reviewing the legislation that I hope to introduce in coming weeks.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Speaker, if I could redirect my question to the Deputy Premier: The Minister of Health basically gave the same answer she did on Thursday with respect to the will of the Legislature. You are the spokesperson for the Liberal side as a whole today during question period. I would ask you directly in your capacity as Deputy Premier to indicate your view on the will of the Legislature from the Minister of Health. Clearly, the Ontario PC caucus and the Ontario NDP caucus support this bipartisan idea for a select committee. Your Minister of Health seems to feel the same. Could you actually speak clearly on behalf of the Ontario Liberal caucus to say: Will you support this select committee to get to the bottom of the Ornge scandal?

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** My focus is on fixing the problems that have been revealed at Ornge. We are taking decisive action to address the issues that are, frankly, of real concern to the people of this province.

We're fixing the problems that have been identified. We're also moving forward with new legislation that will strengthen the transparency and the oversight of the Ministry of Health at Ornge. These are important changes that we're making at Ornge, and I look forward to the support of the members opposite when that legislation does come before the House.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Speaker, I'll try for a third time to speak to the Deputy Premier in his capacity as Deputy Premier in the province of Ontario to indicate the will of the Ontario Liberals. Clearly, the Ontario PCs and the Ontario NDP have suggested that this is the right thing to do. These types of bipartisan efforts are uncommon, I think you'd agree, and now we need to move forward. We could table a motion in the Legislature or committee to do this at the express will of the Legislature. I think we could just cut to the chase today, Deputy Premier, with all due respect, if you speak on behalf of the Liberal caucus and indicate clearly: Do you support the select committee to get to the bottom of the Ornge scandal or do you oppose it? Please let us know which it is.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I would like to take this opportunity to review some of the steps that we have taken to actually get to the bottom of this issue. There were concerns raised. We did our best, within the ministry, to get answers to questions. The Auditor General was stonewalled in getting answers to questions he was raising. When that came to light, we took swift action: a completely new leadership at Ornge, we sent in a forensic audit team, and now the Ontario Provincial Police is doing a thorough investigation.

I think it's important that we let the OPP do their work, that they can do their work so that justice can be done.

1050

## JOB CREATION

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My first question is to the Acting Premier. Apex Fund Services is a global hedge fund based offshore, in Barbados. Last October, the government announced plans to give this offshore hedge fund, with \$20 billion in assets, \$350,000 as a job creation measure. My question is: How many jobs have been created at Apex?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** To the Minister of Economic Development and Innovation.

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** I appreciate the question from the member opposite.

Mr. Speaker, we have invested hundreds of millions of dollars over the years in trying to build an economy here that's creating jobs, that's helping to transition our economy from the old manufacturing jobs to next-generation jobs. The investments we've made have leveraged billions of dollars in private sector investment in Ontario and created tens of thousands of jobs for Ontarians.

I appreciate the fact that the NDP may not understand or appreciate the importance of restructuring our economy, but that's something the people of this province are counting on us to do, and we will continue to make those investments.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Well, Speaker, maybe I can help the minister out a little bit. When we called the office, we were told that there were five employees at Apex. Now, using the freedom of information act, we requested the agreement that the government had with Apex, but of course the jobs clause was blacked out.

Given that your government refused to release the complete agreement with job targets, can we assume that five jobs is the target that you set for a \$350,000 handout to a \$20-billion hedge fund?

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** In all of these investments there are very stringent job targets that are there. There are very stringent investments that have to come from the private sector so that every dollar we invest is leveraged. It's leveraged two times, three times, sometimes up to eight times, depending on the fund and the investment.

It's very important, Mr. Speaker, that we invest in these sectors.

I think what the leader of the third party needs to know is that here in Ontario we have the third-largest life sciences sector in all of North America. That's something we're very proud of. It's something that has not happened—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order.

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** —it's something that's coming about because we're attracting innovation. We're attracting innovative companies to invest here in this province. It's not by accident that we're the second most desirable location in all of North America when it comes to foreign direct investment. It's because of the investments we're making—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Final supplementary.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, the contract with Apex funds has a clawback provision in it, in case they don't meet their targeted job creation numbers. When we called Apex, as I said before, they said they had five employees. Now, my question to the minister is: Has Apex actually met its targets, and if not, how much money has the government successfully clawed back from this \$20-billion hedge fund company?

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** Mr. Speaker, of course we have accountability mechanisms in these programs, and indeed they're enforced, and enforced very readily. Companies that do not meet their job targets will see dollars clawed back on most of these programs.

One of the things we're working very hard on, and I think it follows in line with the Drummond commission, is that we're looking at these investments to look at ways to consolidate and get a one-window approach so that these programs are easier to access for businesses that want to invest in Ontario. So rather than standing in the way of attracting this investment, Mr. Speaker, the NDP should be supporting our efforts to create jobs in Ontario, to attract investors to Ontario and to grow a global leading economy here in this province. That's where we're going—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

### JOB CREATION

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Thank you, Speaker; my next question is to the Acting Premier as well. You know, sadly, Ontario families have seen this movie before. They saw it last month in St. Catharines, when New Food Classics took a government grant of \$1 million and then closed up shop. London families saw it when Caterpillar took their corporate tax giveaways and repaid Ontario by shipping the jobs south of the border.

Families have a pretty simple question, Speaker: Why is public money going to companies that aren't creating jobs, that are laying off workers and that are shipping our jobs somewhere else?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, I thought the investment in Chrysler and General Motors was very important and is an example of how jobs work. The investment in Linamar, which is creating jobs, was an important investment.

**Interjection:** Ken Lewenza.

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** I want to thank Ken Lewenza, the CAW, Chrysler and General Motors for that.

I thought the investments in the Essex engine plant in Windsor, which are protecting 800 jobs, were the right investments.

That leader and her party are shipping jobs everywhere but Ontario. They want to raise the HST. They want to raise taxes. They have no answers to tough questions. We have accountability mechanisms in all these agreements.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Answer?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** I wish you would have supported us at Chrysler. Ask your members from Brampton and Essex how important those jobs are. Shame on you—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Just a small reminder that when I say "question" or I say "answer," you do the wrap-up within a 10-second period, please.

Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** I think the shame should be on a government that gives \$350,000 to a \$20-billion hedge fund.

But nonetheless, for families who are struggling with tough times, it's pretty hard to take. Money that could be used for nurses, for example, to be hired to help with our health care system or to create long-term-care beds is handed to companies who don't create jobs.

Isn't it time for tax measures that actually do start rewarding the job creators in this province?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, this government has eliminated the capital tax, which every major business organization called for. She opposed that. We cut the small business rate. It's now one of the lowest in Canada. That member and her party voted against it. We have harmonized the collection of corporate taxes, which is saving businesses half the cost associated with compliance of tax. That was an important initiative that that member and her party voted against.

She didn't support us when we supported Valiant in Windsor, which continues to employ people right across the city—hundreds of them—as they service a variety of industries. She didn't support us when we invested in a variety of high-tech industries in Waterloo, a key part of our economy.

She wants to have it both ways. She demands help over here and opposes it over there. She needs to be consistent. She needs to understand the economy—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Final supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Well gee, Speaker, I may be mistaken, but I think the minister was actually agreeing with me: All of this largesse that he rails off hasn't

created jobs in Ontario. Hundreds of thousands of jobs are still gone in this province.

In these tough times, what families really want to see is a real plan to create jobs, not no-strings-attached giveaways, like the minister just railed off, to companies that take the money and run—or line their pockets without creating any jobs whatsoever.

Is the minister really finally ready to start taking a look at a real plan to reward the companies that are the job creators by targeting tax relief to companies that are creating jobs, that are making investments, that are training workers in this province?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** In fact, Mr. Speaker, 121,000 net new jobs in the last year. The member opposite doesn't want to acknowledge that. She doesn't want to acknowledge that in spite of a challenge with unemployment that remains, not only here in Ontario but right throughout North America and western Europe, we now have more jobs than we did prior to the downturn.

These are all difficult choices. The member opposite wants to have it both ways. She wants to raise taxes on small business, then she talks about targeting tax cuts to—what about the apprenticeship tax credit? We do that, Mr. Speaker. There are a variety of other initiatives of that nature that we look at all the time.

1100

I can assure the member that we will continue to build on our record of job creation, recognizing the enormous challenge in the economy for those families who still struggle to find work. Mr. Speaker, these are difficult choices that we make. We still haven't heard what that member and her party would do to help create jobs.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Speaker, to the Minister of Health: We know that the \$144-million deal for the Ornge AW139 AgustaWestland helicopters was manipulated. We also know that there is a criminal investigation of that deal and the minister insists on hiding behind that investigation. But the minister can't hide from this: namely, the safety record of those helicopters that the minister now owns and for which she has direct control.

Can the minister tell us if she is aware of the latest airworthiness directive issued on February 17, 2012, by the European Aviation Safety Agency concerning the Agusta AW139 helicopter?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** As the member opposite knows, there is an OPP investigation under way right now as relates to irregular financial arrangements at Ornge. It's vitally important that those of us in this House, if we have information, share that information with the OPP. It's important that we do not jeopardize that investigation.

Speaker, I have put in strong new leadership at Ornge. The new interim CEO, Ron McKerlie, a former deputy minister, is doing his job. We have put in place a very strong board of directors—a very strong board of directors—under the leadership of Ian Delaney, and with

excellent members of that. Patient safety is their number one consideration and they are taking appropriate steps.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Apparently, the minister didn't get this memo either. The airworthiness directive issued just days ago by the EASA warns the owners of the AW139—the minister is one of those—that they are required to conduct repetitive inspections and maintenance of the tail rotors every 25 flight hours and orders to replace them every 600 hours. The reason? They fall off.

In 2009, the tail rotor detached from an AW139 while taxiing for takeoff. Tail rotor detachments were the cause of the following crashes of AW139s: July 2010 in Hong Kong; May 2011 in Qatar; August 2011 in Rio De Janeiro. And now we have 10 of those same helicopters shutting patients in Ontario.

This has nothing to do with a police investigation. What will the minister do to ensure safety of our air ambulance—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Minister of Health.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I can tell you that—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Thank you.

Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Nothing is more important than patient safety, and I think the new board is very much focused on that issue.

We also have excellent engineers and mechanics who work at Ornge and who are very much on top of all of the communiqués that come from the manufacturer. I myself have spoken with some of these mechanics, and I have every confidence that they are doing absolutely everything to keep Ontarians safe.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** My question is for the Acting Premier. Fourteen months ago, in January 2011, at least three staff in the Premier's office were copied on Ornge's briefing note describing the web of for-profit companies connected to the organization and its executives. Jamison Steeve, the Premier's principal secretary, was one of them. As former chief of staff to George Smitherman, he would have had in-depth knowledge of the Ornge file.

Can the Acting Premier explain why Ornge's proposal did not raise alarm bells back then?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** To the Minister of Health.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I think it's very important that the people in this House understand the steps that we have taken to address concerns that have been raised. I don't think there's any question that the steps we have taken enjoy the support, frankly, of the people opposite.

So what have we done, Speaker? Because we were being stonewalled and because the Auditor General was being stonewalled, we were unable to get answers to questions that the people of this province deserve to have. That is why I have taken the action that I have

taken. I called in the forensic audit team. They put a very robust team in Ornge for several weeks. At the end of that process, I felt I had no choice but to call in the Ontario Provincial Police.

We have replaced the leadership at Ornge. We have a very strong new leadership and they are making changes.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** Back to the Deputy Premier: The briefing note was given to three members of the Premier's office and it explained the web of for-profit corporations as well as founders' shares for management, complete with performance incentivization, long-term incentive plans, the 3% solution—and it goes on and on.

Deputy Premier, there is no way those top bureaucrats could have looked at a document like this and not reacted. I don't believe the force of inertia was enough to keep this quiet for 12 months.

Is the reason the Ornge briefing did not raise alarm bells back in January 2011 because they already knew what was going on at Ornge, they supported it and they agreed with it?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, the issues that have been raised regarding Ornge are serious issues. We have taken them very seriously. We have gone step by step in a deliberate strategy to get answers to questions. We could not get those answers, and in hindsight we all believe, Speaker, that the original performance agreement that limited our ability to get information was not strong enough. That's why we're moving forward, not just with a new performance agreement that will have much tighter oversight; it will allow us, for example, to send in a special investigator or even a supervisor if we feel that it is appropriate, just as we do in hospitals.

The new performance agreement will require patient advocates, so that patients will have a voice—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

## IMMIGRATION POLICY

**Ms. Dipika Damerla:** My question this morning is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

Speaker, as we all know, newcomers play a really vital role in Ontario's economy, but not just the economy. They bring their skills and experience to bear on all aspects of Ontario, thereby contributing to one of our biggest assets: our diversity.

Immigrants like Srikanth Dhanthala, who came to Ontario 10 years ago and today runs a company out of North York and Mississauga and employs 150 people, have the world to choose from, so Ontario is in a race against the rest of Canada and the rest of the world to attract the best and the brightest in the world and ensure that they're integrated into our economy.

To this end, I know that the minister announced on March 2 that he's going to be developing a new long-term immigration policy for Ontario. Can the minister—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Minister?

**Hon. Charles Sousa:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the member for the question. The member

makes a very important point: Immigrants are key to Ontario's future economic growth and prosperity. By 2014, immigrants will account for all of Ontario's net labour growth. At the same time, the federal government's selection system doesn't meet Ontario's needs and they continue to make decisions unilaterally.

The time has come for a made-in-Ontario immigration strategy, and that's why we've created this expert roundtable on immigration. They will examine a range of immigrant issues, including recruitment, selection, integration and retention.

I look forward to their findings and recommendations, which will contribute to the development of our long-term immigration strategy, a strategy that will outline how immigrants and immigration can best support Ontario's economic development while improving the economic and social prospects of new immigrants.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Dipika Damerla:** This is very good news. I know that newcomers and businesses in my riding of Mississauga East—Cooksville will be very pleased to hear about Ontario's made-in-Ontario immigration strategy.

It's troubling, however, to hear that the federal government is still refusing to negotiate a new agreement with Ontario. The federal government is responsible for determining who enters the country and in what numbers, but Ontario is in a better position to decide which kind of immigrants are best for our own labour market needs.

Mr. Speaker, through you to the minister: What effect are federal immigration policies having in Ontario?

1110

**Hon. Charles Sousa:** I was pleased that in a recent speech, the federal Minister of Immigration recognized what we've been saying for a long time: The federal immigration policies are hurting Ontario, and changes must be made.

Ontario remains the number one destination for newcomers in Canada. Over 200,000 people destined for Ontario are stuck in huge application backlogs in the federal skilled workers program. At the same time, the provincial nominee program only allows our province to nominate 1,000 individuals per year, a very small number compared to other provinces.

It's unacceptable, Mr. Speaker, that Ontario is the only province that does not have an immigration agreement with the federal government. I continue to encourage the federal government to work with the province instead of unilaterally taking steps that determine Ontario's economic recovery and economic future.

Ontario needs to have a greater say in the immigration selection to ensure the province has an immigration mix that supports our economic—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

## AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** To the Minister of Health: Speaker, airworthiness directives are not a common occurrence.

The minister knew nothing about the airworthiness directive related to the helicopter she now owns. It is clear that the minister must acknowledge her responsibility for the safety of our air ambulance fleet.

I want to ask the minister this question. Knowing what she knows about how that original purchase deal was manipulated, and given that there is, in fact, a criminal investigation around it, and the fact that she now knows that safety was obviously trumped by the kickback related to that deal, I want to know this: Will the minister agree, knowing what she knows, to take the steps necessary to cancel that agreement, demand our money back and tell them to take their helicopters back—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Minister of Health?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I take my responsibility as Minister of Health extremely seriously. That is why I have taken the steps that I have taken to fix the problems at Ornge and to make sure they don't happen again.

As I said earlier, it is vitally important that the OPP investigation not be jeopardized. We need to let that process unfold.

I also have a very real responsibility to make sure that this doesn't happen again, and that is why I am bringing forth legislation that will entrench in law the transparency and oversight of Ornge that I believe the people of this province expect.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** If the minister could depart from her briefing notes just for one question, it may indicate that she actually understands this file.

My question is not related to the financial scandal. It is related directly to the operational scandal over which this minister has direct control and for which she has responsibility.

She now knows that our air ambulance fleet is in serious trouble because of the safety records of that helicopter. This is important for the minister to understand. Those helicopters are at risk, as are the crews and patients who will be flying in them. Why will she not agree to do the responsible thing, cancel this flawed agreement, recover the multi-millions of dollars that paid for those aircraft and ensure that our crews and our—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I think it's very important that the people in this province know that Ornge is there for them when they need it. Air ambulance is a vitally important link in our health care system. It transports patients to get the care they need as quickly as possible.

It's also important that the people of this province understand that we have a very strong new leadership team at Ornge. I will let them do their work, Speaker.

Under the leadership of Dr. Barry McLellan, they have put in place a special committee to look at patient safety issues. This new leadership team at Ornge is absolutely

committed to the same goal that the member opposite has, and that is excellent—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Merci, monsieur le Président. Ma question est dirigée au ministre des Finances.

In 2008, salary disclosures with Ornge CEO Chris Mazza appeared on the public sector disclosure list, more commonly known as the sunshine list, at just under \$300,000 per year. In 2009 and 2010, Chris Mazza's name had suddenly disappeared from this list. We now know that Mazza's salary had ballooned to over \$1.4 million per year, plus extravagant benefits that he was awarded.

Mr. Speaker, why didn't Chris Mazza's exclusion from this list raise any red flags for the minister responsible for the Public Sector Salary Disclosure Act?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** To the Minister of Health.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Well, Speaker, it was exactly that exclusion from the sunshine list that first alerted me and my ministry to the fact that there was something happening at Ornge that ought not to have been happening.

We made several attempts to untangle the for-profit from the not-for-profit and, ultimately, Speaker, it came to the point where I had to send in a forensic audit team from the Ministry of Finance with the very clear instructions to follow the public money. It was only after a meeting that I had with the then-chair and then—COO of Ornge that they did disclose the salaries, and it was then that I knew we had to take further steps.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** Reports indicate that senior officials with the Ministry of Finance were briefed on the web of for-profit companies encircling Ornge: Ornge Global, Ornge Real Estate, Ornge Global Brazil—the list goes on and on.

Will the minister confirm that his senior officials received a separate briefing on Ornge? Why didn't they raise alarms about public money being used to fund private for-profit schemes?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** It was exactly because of that sort of example that we have taken the action we have taken. It's exactly because of situations that the member opposite has raised that we are bringing in much tighter, stricter oversight of Ornge.

Under the new performance agreement, any changes to the corporate structure will require the minister's approval. Ornge will be required to have a patient advocate, just like our hospitals do. There will be much more oversight on the financial planning and monitoring so that this will not happen again.

I don't think there's anyone in this House who doesn't think a stronger performance agreement is the right thing to do.

## PRESCRIPTION DRUG ABUSE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Mr. Speaker, through you, my question is to the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. The abuse of prescription narcotic drugs or pain-killers has emerged as a public health and safety issue in jurisdictions around the world, including here in Ontario. This government has developed a comprehensive mental health and addictions strategy, as well as a narcotics strategy to help address the ongoing issue of drug abuse.

I also understand that there have been important changes regarding a particular drug on the market. Effective March 1, Purdue Pharma withdrew OxyContin from the market and introduced OxyNEO. OxyNEO is reported to be a more tamper-resistant tablet than OxyContin, to prevent misuse.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, to the minister: Given the changes made by the pharmaceutical company in producing this drug, what changes has the ministry made in regard to access to this new drug called OxyNEO?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** This is indeed a very important issue in Ontario. There are important changes in how Oxy is prescribed in Ontario.

Firstly, Ontario Drug Benefit recipients who are currently receiving OxyContin will be automatically transitioned to OxyNEO for a period of up to one year. However, for Ontario Drug Benefit recipients requiring a new OxyNEO prescription, that prescription will be funded through the Exceptional Access Program for chronic pain patients and through the palliative care facilitated access list for palliative care patients.

OxyNEO will not be available for general prescribing through the ODB formulary. Many jurisdictions have made similar changes. These changes are based on the best possible evidence and recommendations from the—

1120

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Speaker, the issue of abuse of prescription narcotics such as OxyContin is a very serious issue particularly in some communities, for example in northern, remote communities. We have heard from First Nations leaders that up to 70% of the adults in those communities are addicted to OxyContin. We also know that there are also people in urban areas who are addicted.

We need to make sure that our government is taking strong action to save lives and improve health outcomes for Ontarians by stopping abuse, addiction and the diversion of narcotics and controlled substances while ensuring that patients who need the pain treatment get it.

Through you, Speaker, to the minister: What is being done to help those addicted to narcotics and, specifically, OxyContin?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** We expect a number of consequences from this change. It could be an important turning point for people with opioid addictions and it is expected that some will seek supports to take this opportunity to kick their habit.

I've called together an expert working group on narcotics addiction. They will provide advice on short- and medium-term responses as OxyContin is coming off the market.

I met with this group last week. They are front-line people, they are academics, they are extremely knowledgeable and are providing very good advice. Work will also continue through the Trilateral First Nations Health Senior Officials committee, co-chaired by Grand Chief Stan Beardy, from the Chiefs of Ontario. They have identified addiction to prescription narcotics as their number one issue.

## AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** My question is for the Minister of Health. The minister will know that all Ornge dispatch calls are recorded. I assume that the emergency health services branch has made her aware of this particular call.

On July 10, 2010, a call was made to Ornge to request the transfer of a stroke patient from Sault Ste. Marie to a Toronto hospital for surgery. The patient's doctor was told that Ornge was sending someone for the patient only to be told in a subsequent call that the transfer was being delayed from the helicopter to a fixed-wing because it would save \$9,000. The doctor is heard on the tape saying, "Is this what it comes down to, that we're making decisions based on money?"

Has the minister been told about this case and is she aware that the ministry is in possession of the tape?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** What I can tell the member opposite is that I have been briefed on the process by which complaints are investigated. I've had a thorough briefing on that issue.

What I can also tell you, Speaker, is that every single complaint is investigated. It doesn't matter whether it comes from a member of the public, a patient, a family member, a physician or from any other ambulance service. No matter where a complaint comes from, that investigation is done. It is done thoroughly and it is done in a timely manner. There is a process whereby complaints result in action and the file is not closed until that work is completed.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** Well, Mr. Speaker, through you to the minister: This is an issue of patient safety. According to reliable sources, the helicopter that was originally to go was at the Sudbury base, staffed with critical care medics and ready to launch. Then it was told to stand down and that a fixed-wing plane would be used later that night. Then, that plane had to fly back to Timmins to get fuel, fly to Sudbury to pick up the critical care medics and then to Sault Ste. Marie for the patient. When the doctor went to Toronto the next day to see his patient, he was shocked to be referred to the morgue.

Was this intentional delay a contributing factor to the patient's death? This is the type of issue that we need to get to the bottom of. That's why we need a select committee. Will the minister agree to a select committee?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, people who work in the health care system are making life-and-death decisions every day, and I have confidence that the system that is in place to review complaints is a very strong system. The issue, when appropriate, is referred to the coroner. The coroner's office and my ministry work very closely together.

The people in health care are professionals. They're in the world of health care because they care about the patients. They want to learn from mistakes and they are very focused on improving safety every step of the way.

There is a process in place, and that process works.

#### DARLINGTON NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** My question is to the Minister of Energy. Why is the minister allowing Ontario Power Generation to spend \$600 million of Ontarians' money to start the refurbishment of the Darlington nuclear reactors without a completed environmental assessment and before the final cost of the project is known?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** Nuclear has been a part of our baseload generation for decades. It's safe, it's reliable and it's clean.

After 25 or 30 years, you need to refurbish the generators and the fuel rods so that you can continue using them for another 30 years. OPG has conducted a competitive approach, and, unlike the world's approach to refurbishment, they're taking a different approach here. The \$600-million contract is called the definition phase, so they can plan, down to 30-minute increments, to make sure that when the actual refurbishment work starts, they have the right project at the right price according to the right specifications—a responsible approach.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** Well, Speaker, this government does not have a particularly good record on these matters. It is trying its best to hide the real cost of power from the families in Ontario. They refuse to reveal the potential cost of cancelled gas plants in Oakville and Mississauga, estimated at hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars. Now the government is committing to a massive contract at Darlington. Will the minister tell us now if the contractor will absorb the risk for all potential overruns?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** Maybe the NDP wants to shut off all the nukes—that's half our power—so turn off half the lights everywhere. Maybe the NDP don't support the 80,000 jobs in the province of Ontario that are tied to the nuclear industry. Maybe the NDP don't support an appropriate and responsible approach to renewing our power generation fleet. That's what this is.

They're taking an entirely different approach. They've learned; they've studied. This contract is the first part of the refurbishment phase, and will enable us to better identify the full cost. It will plan the refurbishment into 30-minute increments, 30-minute periods of time, and transfer the cost of any overruns fully to the contractor. A responsible approach, a responsible—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### SENIOR CITIZENS

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** My question is to the minister responsible for seniors. According to statistics I've seen, Ontario is home to approximately 1.8 million people over the age of 65—that's 13.9% of the entire population of Ontario, and it's growing. Experts are predicting that by 2036, the number of people over the age of 65 in Ontario will be 4.2 million people.

Minister, I'm not the only one who's aware of these statistics. These numbers are often quoted to me by my constituents in Don Valley East. They want to make sure that this government is taking the necessary steps to protect and look after our senior population. They want to make sure that their grandparents and their parents will enjoy their senior years of life in comfort. And they want to make sure that when their time comes, they'll be looked after.

Minister, I don't have to tell you that the decisions we make today as a government will affect the 4.2 million seniors that will be living in the province by 2036. My question to you is, what is this government doing to protect seniors in the province of Ontario?

**Hon. Linda Jeffrey:** The protection and the well-being of our seniors is a top priority for this government, so I want to thank the member from Don Valley East for the question. After all, as he stated, they're our parents, our grandparents and the people who worked hard to help make the Ontario we live in today.

1130

Our government is working hard to ensure that Ontario seniors continue to get the support that they need to live active, healthy lives. As a government, we are committed to providing income support for seniors through tax credits and the Ontario pension system; our home renovation tax credit; making health care services accessible to seniors at home; making affordable housing available to seniors; and protecting seniors from abuse, neglect and harm.

I'm also proud to mention that for the first time in Ontario's history, the care provided to retirement home residents will be regulated under provincial legislation, the Retirement Homes Act, 2010.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** I thank the minister for the response. My constituents will be happy to know that our government is addressing our province's aging situation head-on, and I'll be proud to tell them that our government is the first in Ontario's history to regulate the province's retirement homes. I agree: There are much-needed safeguards to protect our seniors from abuse and neglect, although, Minister, I feel compelled to mention that we are in difficult economic times, and taking on the regulation of retirement homes across the province sounds costly. How will retirement homes be inspected in an efficient and cost-effective manner? More important—

ly, how will the government fund retirement home regulation authorities? Can we really afford this essential action at this time?

**Hon. Linda Jeffrey:** As I stated earlier, the safety and the well-being of seniors who live in retirement homes is a top priority for this government, and that's why we created the Retirement Homes Act. We're proposing that retirement homes across the province be inspected on a risk-based approach. It will enable the Retirement Homes Regulatory Authority to focus its resources on ensuring the requirements for higher-risk homes. This balanced approach, we believe, will ensure appropriate safety and consumer protections for the most vulnerable seniors in Ontario. The regular inspections will be conducted at least once every three years, but higher-risk homes will be inspected as often as necessary to keep our seniors safe. The operators not in compliance with the RHRA regulations could face fines or be shut down. Once fully established, the RHRA will not receive any more government funding. It's a small, reasonable fee that we believe is reasonable to protect our seniors.

#### RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy. Minister, let me read you recent worldwide headlines: "Arrivederci Solare: Italy Cuts Solar Subsidy"; "Dutch Pull the Plug on Wind Subsidies"; "UK Solar Subsidies Slashed"; "Germany Slashes FIT"; and "Spain Halts Renewable Subsidies to Curb \$31 Billion of Debts." Minister, when is the Liberal government going to learn what the rest of the world already knows?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** We are committed to clean air. We're committed to the clean energy jobs. We've taken an approach in the province of Ontario that both brings in clean—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Order. Merci beaucoup.

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** We've also taken an approach in Ontario that not only enables us to bring on the clean energy and clean up the air, but with our requirement of Ontario-based content we've made sure that we've grown a clean energy industry here.

My friend will know that in all parts of this province there are thousands of clean energy jobs and billions of dollars of investment specifically tied to the feed-in tariff approach we've taken in Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Our party believes in clean energy, but at a price that seniors can afford. Under the Liberals' failed energy plan, bills rose 26% in the last two years and are expected to rise 46% in the next three years. Thousands of jobs are leaving Ontario for cheaper energy in Quebec and the US. The Auditor General told us that we lose two to four jobs for any green job created.

Minister, how many more jobs are you going to be prepared to lose before you cancel the FIT program and fix this disastrous energy plan?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** Well, I know the honourable member believes in green energy because he put solar panels on the roof of the city hall. But his party, I think, is very much the party of coal. The world is going greener. We've got thousands of green energy jobs.

This morning, we met with the international press, who are here to celebrate and observe what we're doing in terms of the smart grid.

It's time the party opposite recognizes the world is going green. We're determined to be leaders. There are no jobs for followers. Join us. I say to the honourable member, get your—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Contrary to what some people might believe, this isn't a competition as to who can yell the loudest. Just a thought.

New question.

#### ONTARIO NORTHLAND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** The question is to the Deputy Premier: Premier, in the Drummond report, under page 324, there is a mention here that says, "Studies and reviews conducted over the past several years in Ontario and other provinces illustrate how its services"—and we're talking about the Ontario Northland—"could be provided more effectively and efficiently" through targeted privatization of that particular company.

You stood with us, sir, in opposition to the Mike Harris government, opposing privatization of ONR. Is it still your position today?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** To the Minister of Northern Development and Mines.

**Hon. Rick Bartolucci:** Listen, let's look at the history. The Tories wanted to privatize this. In 2003, we ran and we said we would be as creative as possible to try to make the ONTC a very viable entity. Our government has long supported the ONTC, providing almost \$490 million in funding since 2003.

The reality is, we will continue to look, through the Grow North initiative, at a multimodal transportation system that suits the needs of northerners, that ensures that there will be a modern transportation system in northern Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Minister, this agency reports to you, and my question was very simple. While we were in opposition together to the Mike Harris government, you stood with me in this House and you went to the rallies. You opposed the privatization, in whole or in part, of the ONTC. My question to you is simple: Do you still maintain that you will not privatize, in part or in whole, the Ontario Northland commission? Yes or no?

**Hon. Rick Bartolucci:** Listen, I will match our government's record with regard to the ONTC against anybody or any party's record with regard to the ONTC.

The Drummond report asked us to ensure that we have a very productive, modern transportation system in place that meets the needs of northerners. We're ensuring that

that takes place. We're doing that through a multimodal transportation study, which is being headed by the Ministry of Transportation and the Ministry of Innovation. We will continue to ensure that northerners always have a very, very modern, multimodal transportation—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

## TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

**Mrs. Teresa Piruzza:** Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure. Earlier this year, ReNew Canada came out with their annual list of the biggest infrastructure projects in Canada. I was not surprised to see the Windsor-Essex Parkway on that list at number 22, ahead of the Bruce-to-Milton transmission corridor and the Calgary International Airport development. The parkway is practically in my backyard, and it's amazing to see the amount of work that's occurring. It looks different every day I drive it.

This project is creating thousands of jobs in the area, and we want assurances that the Ministry of Transportation will see this vital project through and do so on an aggressive schedule. Can the minister commit to that for the residents of Windsor-Essex?

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** I want to wholeheartedly assure the member for Windsor West that the building of the Windsor-Essex Parkway to connect Highway 401 with the new Canadian international plaza remains at the top of our infrastructure and economic priorities. It is a \$1.4-billion investment that's creating about 12,000 jobs. We view this scale of investment as a necessity for Ontario's future economic prosperity.

More than \$100 billion a year in trade flows between Canada and the US through the Windsor-Detroit border, and much of that trade happens over infrastructure that's almost 100 years old. This project is critically important, not just for Ontario but for Canada and North America as a whole.

I can tell the member that over the next few months, various aspects of the parkway construction will be going out for subcontracting, and that will mean jobs and job opportunities for families in Windsor-Essex.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for Cambridge has given notice of his intention to raise a point of privilege. The member's point relates to a passage on November 24, 2011, of his private member's motion calling on the government to table a detailed plan relating to hospital expansion projects by March 1, 2012. The member alleges that, since this plan was not tabled by that date, Thursday of last week, this represents a contempt of the Legislature.

I am prepared to rule on this point of privilege without hearing further from the member for Cambridge or anyone, as standing order 21(d) permits me to do.

As is the case with all private members' notices of motion, the one put forward last fall by the member for

Cambridge was preceded by the words, "In the opinion of this House."

As the member noted in his written submission, House of Commons Procedure and Practice states:

"Hence, such motions which simply suggest that the government initiate a certain measure are generally phrased as follows: 'That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider....' The government is not bound to adopt a specific policy or course of action as a result of the adoption of such a resolution since the House is only stating an opinion or making a declaration of purpose. This is in contrast to those motions whose object is to give a direction to committees, members or officers of the House or to regulate House proceedings and, as such, are considered orders once adopted by the House."

It is settled in the Ontario Legislature that private members' motions may only have the effect of stating an opinion of the House. In an October 24, 2001, ruling, Speaker Carr ruled that:

"As members well know, private members' motions are typically framed so that if and when they carry, they constitute expressions of the opinion of the House; in other words, they are said to be non-binding. This same principle has been applied on several occasions during the time allotted to consideration of private members' public business when the Speaker has denied requests for unanimous consent to give third reading to a bill or to alter some later proceeding of the House. When members are meeting for the purpose of considering private members' business, they cannot bind the House to a final decision on a matter. Were it otherwise, a government could easily take advantage of its majority and a time-limited private members' debate to pass motions which could, for example, amend the standing orders. This is clearly not the intended purpose of private members' public business."

The motion of the member for Cambridge that passed last November was, as mentioned, framed in the typical and acceptable way for private members' motions in this House. It is clear in our practice and precedent that such motions, when passed, serve to express an opinion of the Legislature but are not binding or directive. While one might like or expect requests such as the one embodied in the member's motion to be complied with—and that is all it is, in effect; a request—there is no compulsion to do so.

I therefore find that the member for Cambridge has not made out a *prima facie* case of privilege.

## DEFERRED VOTES

### ATTRACTING INVESTMENT AND CREATING JOBS ACT, 2012

### LOI DE 2012 VISANT À ATTIRER LES INVESTISSEMENTS ET À CRÉER DES EMPLOIS

Deferred vote on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 11, An Act respecting the continuation and establishment of development funds in order to promote regional economic development in eastern and southwestern Ontario / Projet de loi 11, Loi concernant la prorogation et la création de fonds de développement pour promouvoir le développement économique régional dans l'Est et le Sud-Ouest de l'Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Call in the members. This will be a five-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1144 to 1149.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Members, take your seats, please.

On December 6, 2011, Mr. Milloy moved second reading of Bill 11.

All those in favour, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Ayes

Albanese, Laura	Duguid, Brad
Armstrong, Teresa J.	Duncan, Dwight
Balkisson, Bas	Flynn, Kevin Daniel
Bartolucci, Rick	Forster, Cindy
Bentley, Christopher	Gerretsen, John
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Gélinas, France
Best, Margaret	Gravelle, Michael
Bisson, Gilles	Horwath, Andrea
Bradley, James J.	Hoskins, Eric
Broten, Laurel C.	Jaczek, Helena
Campbell, Sarah	Jeffrey, Linda
Cansfield, Donna H.	Kwintar, Monte
Chan, Michael	Leal, Jeff
Chiarelli, Bob	MacCharles, Tracy
Colle, Mike	Mangat, Amrit
Coteau, Michael	Mantha, Michael
Crack, Grant	Marchese, Rosario
Craitor, Kim	Matthews, Deborah
Damerla, Dipika	Mauro, Bill
Delaney, Bob	McGuinity, Dalton
Dhillon, Vic	McMeekin, Ted
Dickson, Joe	McNeely, Phil
DiNovo, Cheri	Meilleur, Madeleine

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** All those opposed, please rise one at a time and be recognized by the Clerk.

#### Nays

Arnott, Ted	Klees, Frank	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Bailey, Robert	Leone, Rob	Pettapiece, Randy
Barrett, Toby	MacLaren, Jack	Scott, Laurie
Chudleigh, Ted	MacLeod, Lisa	Shurman, Peter
Dunlop, Garfield	McDonell, Jim	Smith, Todd
Elliott, Christine	McKenna, Jane	Thompson, Lisa M.
Fedeli, Victor	McNaughton, Monte	Walker, Bill
Hardeman, Ernie	Miller, Norm	Wilson, Jim
Harris, Michael	Milligan, Rob E.	Witmer, Elizabeth
Hudak, Tim	Munro, Julia	Yakabuski, John
Jackson, Rod	Nicholls, Rick	Yurek, Jeff
Jones, Sylvia	O'Toole, John	

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):** The ayes are 68; the nays are 35.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I declare the motion carried.

*Second reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the bill be referred to the Standing Committee on General Government.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** So ordered.

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Point of order for the member from Simcoe-Grey.

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** We appreciate that we can't challenge your ruling on the member from Cambridge's point of privilege, but I would ask the government, then: Please change your arrogant behaviour. Listen to the will of this House and—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** There being no further business, this House stands recessed until 1 p.m. this afternoon.

*The House recessed from 1154 to 1300.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** I earlier introduced the family of page Sophia Sengfah, but the family wasn't in the room at the time. Now the family is in the room, so I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce mother and father Sai Shwe and Jakai Shwe, as well as sister Grace Sengfah. I would welcome everyone to welcome them together.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### HIGHWAY ACCIDENT

**Mr. Randy Pettapiece:** On Monday, February 6, a beautiful day in Hampstead was shattered by tragedy. On that day, a tragic accident killed 11 people, including 10 farm workers from Peru and the driver of a transport truck. Three others were injured.

But in the face of tragedy, we saw the true character of our community. From the professional, dedicated first responders to the neighbours who took action, to those who donated to the community trust fund, and to the many who simply said a prayer, we know the character of our community is strong.

I saw that again on February 10 at a community prayer vigil held at St. Joseph's Catholic church in Stratford. I saw that again on February 25, at an auction and evening of live entertainment. That event raised \$15,000 for the families of the victims and survivors. I want to thank event organizers Sue Dunfield and Stewart Reynolds.

Finally, I want to recognize another constituent, who represents the very best of our community's character. After reading about the Hampstead tragedy, 11-year-old Kiara Wells of Listowel took action. Hoping to raise \$100 for the victims' families, Kiara started a penny drive. She called it Pennies for Peru. So far, Kiara has passed her goal of \$100, raising over \$400. Kiara, thank you. May all of us follow your example of character and service.

Let's also remember, Speaker, that we are not in that much of a hurry that we cannot take the time to drive safely.

## UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO DIRECTIONS PROGRAM

**Ms. Sarah Campbell:** On Saturday evening, I was fortunate to meet with six students from Dryden High School—Tara, Darren, Kayla, Clarissa, and Conan—and their teacher, Sherry Ambridge. These students are among 13 from across my riding who are taking part in the University of Waterloo's annual DIRECTIONS program for aboriginal youth. The program provides First Nations students with the opportunity to travel to Waterloo and take part in a number of workshops that showcase their post-secondary options. The program also focuses on increasing their academic self-confidence, thereby increasing the likelihood of their success.

Programs like this serve as very important ways to show our First Nations students that there are many opportunities for them out there if they dedicate themselves and work hard to succeed.

I would like to congratulate these students and all of the participants of the program, as well as the University of Waterloo for creating an affordable program that makes a real difference in the lives of First Nations students. I would also like to thank Keewatin-Patricia District School Board for being a leader and encouraging their students to succeed.

I would particularly like to recognize Sherry Ambridge for her commitment to this program and her dedication to her students.

## GLOBAL COMMUNITY ALLIANCE

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** One week ago Saturday, the Global Community Alliance held their annual gala dinner marking Black History Month at the Sheraton Hotel in Ottawa. During the gala, several deserving individuals were presented with community service awards.

Reverend Anthony Bailey received his award for the work he has done in rebuilding the congregation at Parkdale United Church, which is now one of the most culturally diverse congregations in the city of Ottawa.

Suzan Lavertu is the founder of the School of Afro-Caribbean Dance, which is committed to preserving and sharing Afro-Caribbean culture through dance. The school has a performing company and focuses on various forms of African and Caribbean dance for youth and adults.

Finally, the Young Black Professionals of Ottawa also received an award for helping young people of colour make the transition from college and university into the business world by providing mentoring, social networking and professional development. The keynote speaker of the event was Adrian Harewood, who is the co-host of CBC News in Ottawa and a bright young star in the broadcasting industry.

The gala evening was organized by Ottawa-Orléans resident Moses Pratt, his wife Kelly and their children Tembeka and Lanre, with the help of Zybina Richards and Bertillia Christian.

The Global Community Alliance was formed in 2009 to help highlight the diversity that fosters unity within the

Ottawa community, raise awareness of some of the issues in the community and recognize the efforts of individuals, associations, business and organizations that make a significant difference within Ottawa's global community.

I would once again like to congratulate Moses Pratt and his family for putting on another wonderful event to celebrate and honour the black community in Ottawa.

## RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr. Bill Walker:** This Liberal government has ignored the people in rural Ontario by not answering our repeated call for a moratorium on industrial wind industry. Yet, when it came to the health concerns of people in Scarborough, Oakville and Mississauga, this Liberal government responded by instantly bringing in moratoriums on offshore wind and gas plant projects. Clearly, this is a double standard.

It seems there are two sets of rules where, one could argue, the voice, concerns and wishes of vote-rich cities command this government, while rural Ontario is ignored. The Liberal government does so at a great expense to the entire province.

Contrary to the advice of the Auditor General, contrary to the advice of energy, health and economic experts who warned against the coming crisis—a surplus of energy and paying others billions of dollars to take it, driving energy bills through the roof and losing jobs due to high electricity prices—the Premier steamrolled ahead anyway.

As it stands, this government is clearly broke, financially and democratically. But the government's ignorance came to a grinding halt just recently when Ornge was officially added to the list of spending scandals, along with eHealth, OLG and the cancelled gas plants. With billions of precious tax dollars wasted and no new jobs created, this government is clearly out of control. The question now becomes: Just who is calling the shots in this government?

To my fellow backbenchers on that side of the House I say this: When you vote on Lisa Thompson's moratorium motion this Thursday, vote according to your conscience, according to your beliefs and those of your constituents, not your party. Please do the right thing and vote for a moratorium.

## NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** It is a pleasure to rise today to acknowledge the work of the National Farmers Union Local 353 in my riding, who held their annual general meeting this past Saturday.

I was fortunate enough to be invited as their guest speaker and had the opportunity to talk to the members of the NFU in Essex county about issues regarding regional concern and, of course, provincial concern, and we also addressed some of our national issues.

Mr. Speaker, the NFU has long provided a progressive voice for farmers across this country. They promote sustainability, equality and the security and sovereignty

of our food system in a whole host of ways. They bring about a wide variety of ideas when it comes to energy efficiency and the safeguarding of our environment; they are the stewards of our land. It was really a pleasure to be able to discuss some of those issues with them.

They're certainly concerned about the economic aspects of our province, but yet they feel that farmers can play a really vital role in that, and indeed they have. They've provided the backstop for our economic downturn. When times were tough, farmers were there, still providing us with a safe, reliable source of food and regional job creation. That's something we often forget. These are local jobs that provide local food. It's something that the NFU promotes, something I certainly promote as an associate member of the NFU, as I rejoined this past Saturday, and I urge all members to contact their local chapter of the NFU, become aware of the policies they promote and support them in this House and across the province at large.

#### DARLINGTON NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION

**Mr. Joe Dickson:** I rise today to mark a significant milestone in Ontario Power Generation's refurbishment project at Darlington nuclear. OPG has awarded a two-phase contract to plan for and then replace major components of the four reactors at Darlington. The contract for more than \$600 million to a joint venture of SNC-Lavalin Nuclear and Aecon Construction is one of several that will be awarded for the refurbishment of the facility.

1310

Mr. Speaker, the good news in this announcement is twofold: One, the refurbishment, once complete, will allow Darlington to produce safe, clean, reliable nuclear energy for another 25 to 30 years; two, the project will create 6,000 jobs, and most of them will be in Durham region, including my communities of Ajax and Pickering. This is an investment in nuclear energy and in Durham region. We expect the project to inject approximately \$800 million into our local economy.

I thank the Ontario government and Ontario Power Generation for its commitment to a balanced electricity supply mix in the province, maintaining nuclear energy as 50% of our baseload instead of dirty coal, and for once again investing in my Durham region. I also pay tribute to regional council and chair Roger Anderson and Clarington council and Mayor Adrian Foster.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's wonderful being here again today, especially with that trimmed moustache.

#### DURHAM COLLEGE

**Mrs. Christine Elliott:** In a recent meeting, members from Durham College relayed their disappointment that this government had overlooked their application to

pursue a jointly funded phase 3 development of their campus. This proposal would see 900 new post-secondary spaces created in some of the fastest-growing fields of study in the province, including the culinary, hospitality and urban agriculture programs.

Members of Durham College are concerned that despite the clear economic imperative for this development, the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities did not include Durham College's proposal on a list of 20 projects that will receive provincial funding. In other words, of the almost \$600 million spent on new infrastructure projects, not a single dollar was allocated to one of the province's fastest-growing colleges in one of the province's fastest-growing regions.

What's more troubling is the fact that 18 of the 20 post-secondary projects were awarded to colleges in Liberal ridings, despite the fact that many of those colleges have seen declining enrolment numbers.

Mr. Speaker, given the fact that Durham region is one of the fastest-growing regions in the province, given the fact that Durham College has a distinguished record of delivering its knowledge infrastructure programs on time and on budget, and given the fact that the college planned to fundraise a significant part of this project, not just depending on a government handout, I would respectfully request that Durham College be given due and fair consideration in future development applications.

#### EDUCATION

**Mr. Bas Balkissoon:** Mr. Speaker, faced with tough economic times, our government is making thoughtful choices to build a better Ontario. We're watching our finances just as families watch theirs. We are making sure services we all rely on are even better.

Nothing is more important than quality education. That's why we have worked so hard with parents and teachers to reduce class sizes, improve quality, and see hundreds of thousands more students through to graduation and beyond. That's why we're protecting the investments we have made in our children in full-day kindergarten. Mr. Speaker, this is very important to parents and children in my riding.

McKinsey has measured Ontario schools against the rest of the world and says that, together, we have created one of the best education systems in the world. Just last week, I was pleased to see that the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development recognized Ontario as a "world leader in its sustained strategy of professionally driven education reform." The OECD highlighted the innovative strategies our government has adopted to increase our students' success. They have recognized how successful we have been at increasing literacy and numeracy results and improving graduation rates. They single out our Equity and Inclusive Education strategy for helping schools reduce discrimination.

We are building on that great foundation with the Accepting Schools Act, and we're making the choices that will continue the progress we've made in our education together.

## LAUREN HANNA

**Ms. Lisa M. Thompson:** I rise today to give recognition to the Ontario legislative internship program and particularly the intern whom I have had the pleasure of hosting in my office: Lauren Hanna.

What is unique about this program is that the interns choose the MPPs and not the other way around. I feel honoured as a new MPP to have been selected by Lauren as her host office. Lauren recognized that Huron–Bruce matters and, for that matter, rural Ontario matters.

Lauren is from Aurora and has recently completed her honours bachelor of arts in political science from Acadia University in Nova Scotia. She has been a great help in our office, writing speeches and statements and doing much research on renewable, affordable energy in Ontario.

Lauren visited the great riding of Huron–Bruce on a few occasions, got behind the scenes in terms of a tour of Bruce Power, climbed inside a wind turbine, and was instrumental in the grand opening of two of my constituency offices in Kincardine and Blyth. Lauren's energy and keen interest in rural Ontario made her a perfect fit in our office.

I recommend the internship program not only to other graduates interested in pursuing a career in the political world, but to my colleagues here in the Legislature.

Lauren departs our office at the end of this week, but I wanted to take a moment and to thank her in the Legislature for all of her hard work, especially her work in advance of my second reading of my private member's motion on Thursday. Thank you, Lauren, and best wishes.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I beg to inform the House of the following exchange in the order of precedence for private members' public business: Mr. Yakabuski assumes ballot item number 23 and Ms. Scott assumes ballot item number 37.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC  
AMENDMENT ACT  
(ROADSIDE ASSISTANCE  
VEHICLES), 2012  
LOI DE 2012 MODIFIANT  
LE CODE DE LA ROUTE  
(VÉHICULES D'ASSISTANCE  
ROUTIÈRE)

Mr. Dunlop moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 38, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act with respect to safety precautions to take when approaching roadside assistance vehicles / Projet de loi 38, Loi modifiant le Code de la route en ce qui concerne

les mesures de sécurité à prendre à l'approche de véhicules d'assistance routière.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for a short statement.

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** The bill amends the Highway Traffic Act. At present, the driver of a motor vehicle is required to slow down upon approaching an emergency vehicle that is stopped on the same side of a highway as that on which the driver is travelling. The bill extends the requirement to cover cases where a driver approaches a roadside assistance vehicle that is stopped on that side.

Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, could I read the names of people who are here today? Because they weren't here earlier.

There are a number of people here today from the CAA. They're slowly working their way into the room. I would like to acknowledge John Ennis, Frances Mannarino, Ms. Pat Nielson, Anna Halkidis, Bruno Iafrate, Christine Alum, Tony Salerno, Phil Wilson, Rick Mauro, Teresa Di Felice and Henry Westenbrink. I'd like to welcome them here to Queen's Park on their advocacy day.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** We welcome our guests. That wouldn't be a point of order, but I'm glad they're here.

## PETITIONS

## RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr. John O'Toole:** I'm pleased to present a petition on behalf of my constituents in the riding of Durham. It reads as follows:

"Whereas Solray Energy Corp. has given notice of its proposal for a class 3 solar power facility known as Epsom Solar Farm to be located in the township of Scugog; and

"Whereas the site is on"—this is the issue here—"prime" agricultural land "that has been in production for many generations; and

"Whereas we consider productive farmland to be of vital importance to farm and rural communities by providing healthy, locally grown food and ensuring the sustainability of Canada's food supply; and

"Whereas class 1 to 5 farmland ... that is zoned rural or agricultural should be protected from" McGuinty's "current proposal and similar projects that may be considered in the future; and

"Whereas other sites of less" valuable agricultural land "are better locations for solar power developments"—if at all, at 80 cents a kilowatt hour;

1320

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature not to allow large, industrial solar farms on prime agricultural land, and we further express our

support for giving local communities, through their elected municipal" officials, "the power to control and approve large-scale renewable energy developments" in their municipalities.

I sign this and give it to Katelyn, one of the taller pages here today.

#### DOG OWNERSHIP

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** This is a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas currently the law takes the onus off of owners that raise violent dogs by making it appear that violence is a matter of genetics; and

"Whereas the Dog Owners' Liability Act does not clearly define a pit bull, nor is it enforced equally across the province, as pit bulls are not an acknowledged breed;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Legislative Assembly passes Bill 16, the Public Safety Related to Dogs Statute Law Amendment Act, 2011, into law."

I couldn't agree more. I'm going to give it to Patrick to be delivered to the table, and sign my name.

#### SCHOOL CLOSURES

**Ms. Lisa M. Thompson:** It's my pleasure to present this petition with respect to the decision to close Blyth Public School by the Avon Maitland District School Board.

"Whereas the pupil accommodation review states that an ARC committee is required, among other things, to determine the value of a school to the local economy, yet in the case of the Blyth Public School, there is in the minutes of the ARC committee not a single reference to any discussion of the effects of school closure on the local economy; and

"Whereas the same guideline states that the ARC, which is appointed by the board, must include membership drawn from the school community and the broader community, including, among others, business and municipal leaders, yet THE ARC meetings considering the Blyth Public School included no Blyth business or municipal leaders; and

"Whereas the only invitations to public meetings in Blyth regarding the accommodation review were taken home by students to their parents, with the result that the broader community were not represented in the discussions; and

"Whereas many other communities across Ontario are now encountering very similar behaviours by their school boards; and

"Whereas single-school communities across Ontario are being permanently damaged economically and socially by the closure of their only school, which is, according to Premier McGuinty, the heart and soul of these communities; and

"Whereas the current Education Act of Ontario very undemocratically provides school boards with the absolute power to close any school they choose, with no avenue of appeal available to anyone, not even members of their own communities;

"Therefore, we, the residents of Ontario who have signed our names below, do hereby petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to adopt and enact the following measures:

"(1) An immediate moratorium on all disputed school closures resulting from the accommodation review process and continuing until June 30, 2015; and

"(2) The immediate striking of a truly independent third party body with the authority to review and reverse all disputed school closures found to be detrimental to the community or in conflict with other provincial programs or regulations; and

"(3) Revision of the Education Act to require school boards to work with their municipalities and communities to ensure school closures comply with the principles and practices of sound community and educational planning."

I agree with this petition, and I affix my signature and I will give it to David to give to the Clerk.

#### DIAGNOSTIC SERVICES

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** I have these petitions from the people of northeastern Ontario, and they read as follows:

"Whereas the Ontario government" is making PET scanning "a publicly insured health service available to cancer and cardiac patients...; and

"Whereas," since October 2009, "insured PET scans" are performed "in Ottawa, London, Toronto, Hamilton and Thunder Bay; and

"Whereas the city of Greater Sudbury is a hub for health care in northeastern Ontario, with" Health Sciences North, its regional cancer program "and the Northern Ontario School of Medicine;

"We ... petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make PET scans available through" Health Sciences North, "thereby serving and providing equitable access to the citizens of northeastern Ontario."

I fully support this petition, Mr. Speaker, and will affix my name to it and ask page Judy to bring it to the clerks' table.

#### WIND TURBINES

**Mr. Bill Walker:** "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas residents of Ontario want a moratorium on all further industrial wind turbine development until a third party health and environmental study has been completed; and

"Whereas people in Ontario living within close proximity to industrial wind turbines have reported negative health effects; we need to study the physical, social, economic and environmental impacts of wind turbines; and

"Whereas Ontario's largest farm organization, the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, and the Christian Farmers Federation of Ontario have called for a suspension of industrial wind turbine development until the serious shortcomings can be addressed, and the Auditor General confirmed wind farms were created in haste and with no planning; and

"Whereas there has been no third party health and environmental studies done on industrial wind turbines, and the Auditor General confirmed there was no real plan for green energy in Ontario and wind farms were constructed in haste;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Liberal government support Huron-Bruce MPP Lisa Thompson's private member's motion which calls for a moratorium on all industrial wind turbine development until a third party health and environmental study has been completed."

I affix my seal to this and give it to Adrian to present to the House on my behalf.

#### BAITFISH INDUSTRY

**Ms. Sarah Campbell:** I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of the live bait industry. It reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Ministry of Natural Resources recognize and work with the live baitfish industry to ensure a viable, quality baitfish product for the anglers of Ontario."

I support this petition and will affix my signature.

#### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** My petition is from the parents and children of Avalon Public School in Ottawa-Orleans.

"To the Legislature of Ontario:

"Whereas the current enrolment of Avalon Public School is 687 students;

"Whereas the student capacity of the school is 495 students, as determined by the Ministry of Education's own occupancy formula;

"Whereas the issue of overcrowding and lack of space makes it impossible for Avalon Public School to offer full-day kindergarten until the overcrowding issue is addressed;

"Whereas Avalon Public School is located in a high-growth community;

"Whereas the enrolment at Avalon Public School is expected to continue rising at a rate of 10% to 15% a year for the foreseeable future;

"Whereas the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board has made building a new school in Avalon a top capital priority;

"We, the undersigned, call on the province of Ontario and Ministry of Education to provide the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board with the necessary

funding to build an additional school in Avalon, to open no later than September 2014."

I send this to the desk with Samantha.

#### WIND TURBINES

**Mr. John O'Toole:** This was on wind turbines as opposed to solar, which was my previous one.

"Whereas there is a growing body of evidence confirming industrial wind development has serious adverse effects on host communities;

"Whereas over 135 people in Ontario have reported serious negative health effects from industrial wind development, and at least a dozen families have been bought out of their homes" to avoid controversy;

"Whereas Ontario's Green Energy Act has ended local planning control by stripping municipal councils of their rights;

"Whereas 80 municipal councils, representing two million Ontarians, called on the government to put in place a full moratorium on industrial wind development until an independent epidemiological health study is completed, proper environmental regulations and protections are put in place, and local democracy is restored;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Immediately put a moratorium on all industrial wind proposals; fund an independent epidemiological health study to develop safe setbacks; legislate those findings; develop stringent environmental protection standards for natural areas; and require all projects to comply with regulations based on science," not on politics.

I'm pleased to sign and support this and present it to Sophia.

#### HYDRO RATES

**Mr. Michael Mantha:** I'd like to present this petition on behalf of residents in Algoma-Manitoulin.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Ontario taxpayers have been paying over millions in extra charges on their hydro bills to help retire the debt. The amount collected to date as per the Auditor General's report is \$8.7 billion, but the amount owing was \$7.8 billion;

"Whereas Ontario taxpayers are asking, where is the money being invested?

"Whereas Ontario taxpayers are asking why this was not addressed at the time the debt was paid;

"Whereas electrical rates have increased with the new creation of green energy coming online to include solar and wind, refurbishment of nuclear plants and deregulation of Hydro One;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows to obtain answers to the following questions:

1330

"How much of the debt remains?

"When will it be eliminated from Ontario taxpayers' hydro bills?"

On behalf of the residents of Algoma-Manitoulin, I will be signing this petition and presenting it to Mackenzie, who is also from Algoma-Manitoulin.

### RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** A petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the residents of Elgin-Middlesex-London are concerned about the sacrifice of 400 acres of prime agricultural land in the town of Belmont to the development of a solar farm despite the Green Energy Act's prohibition of building on such high-grade agricultural land;

"Whereas the company First Solar" Inc. "claims their use of such valuable land is justified under the older renewable energy framework that was in place when the company received its OPA contracts;

"Whereas the government has grandfathered the project into the new Green Energy Act, thereby allowing the company to circumvent any municipal opinion and review;

"Whereas the government has effectively allowed this project to use favourable aspects of two separate regulatory frameworks while avoiding aspects of those same frameworks that are meant to protect one of Ontario's most vital finite resources: its world-class agricultural land;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To put a moratorium on the" First Solar "development in Belmont until the province decides by which set of regulations First Solar is to abide."

I agree with this petition and I affix my signature.

### WIND TURBINES

**Mr. Michael Harris:** I'm happy to read a petition on behalf of residents in some beautiful communities next door to us: Bayfield, Goderich etc.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas residents of Ontario want a moratorium on all further industrial wind turbine development until a third party health and environmental study has been completed; and

"Whereas people in Ontario living within close proximity to industrial wind turbines have reported negative health effects; we need to study the physical, social, economic and environmental impacts of" such "wind turbines; and

"Whereas Ontario's largest farm organization, the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, and the Christian Farmers Federation of Ontario have called for a suspension of industrial wind turbine development until the serious shortcomings can be addressed, and the Auditor General confirmed wind farms were created in haste and with no planning; and

"Whereas there have been no third party health and environmental studies done on industrial wind turbines, and the Auditor General confirmed there was no real plan

for green energy in Ontario and wind farms were constructed in haste;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the Liberal government support Huron-Bruce MPP Lisa Thompson's private member's motion which calls for a moratorium on all industrial wind turbine development until a third party health and environmental study has been completed."

I affix my name to this petition and send it down with David to the table.

### EYE EXAMINATIONS

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** "To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas it is unmistakable that clear and pain-free eyesight is a crucial factor in enabling Ontarians, young and old, to go about their daily lives and fully participate in democratic society;

"Whereas the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care clearly states that 'OHIP coverage includes the lens that the patient's physician determines is medically necessary for the individual patient at the time of (cataract) surgery ... No amount may be charged to the patient for the medically necessary lens or eye tests, or for other necessary add-ons to the insured services, such as premises, equipment, supplies and personnel that are required to provide the service;'

"Whereas the government of Ontario is demanding that its citizens pay a \$300 fee for a mandatory eye exam prior to having cataract surgery;

"Whereas it is contradictory and disingenuous for the government of Ontario to cover the costs of cataract surgery while at the same time subjecting recipients of the surgery to a \$300 eye exam in order to receive the surgery;

"We, the undersigned"—the hundreds of undersigned—"do hereby petition the government of Ontario to cover the costs of citizens required to undergo an eye exam for Ontarians prior to having cataract surgery."

I agree with this, sign my name and will pass it on to page Adrian.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

SECURITY FOR COURTS, ELECTRICITY  
GENERATING FACILITIES  
AND NUCLEAR FACILITIES ACT, 2012  
LOI DE 2012 SUR LA SÉCURITÉ  
DES TRIBUNAUX, DES CENTRALES  
ÉLECTRIQUES ET DES INSTALLATIONS  
NUCLÉAIRES

Resuming the debate adjourned on March 1, 2012, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 34, An Act to repeal the Public Works Protection Act, amend the Police Services Act with respect to court

security and enact the Security for Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012 / *Projet de loi 34, Loi abrogeant la Loi sur la protection des ouvrages publics, modifiant la Loi sur les services policiers en ce qui concerne la sécurité des tribunaux et édictant la Loi de 2012 sur la sécurité des centrales électriques et des installations nucléaires.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Further debate on second reading of Bill 34? I recognize the member for Ottawa—Orléans.

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** Thank you, Speaker. I'm pleased to rise today to speak on An Act to repeal the Public Works Protection Act, amend the Police Services Act with respect to court security and enact the Security for Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012.

This is a response to the Public Works Protection Act legislation which was passed in 1939 when the Second World War was raging and I was all of one year old. It was intended to protect power plants, dams, bridges and other critical infrastructure from sabotage during the war. While its powers have not been used extensively, it does serve two main purposes: court security, allowing peace officers to request identification from and search a person, vehicle or property entering or on court premises; and the security of power generating facilities.

The use of the Public Works Protection Act during the G20 summit in downtown Toronto showed the need to protect civil rights in Ontario. The legislation was used in a way that many individuals lost the protection of their rights to protest peacefully in their own city, in their own province.

These are two legitimate uses of this legislation, but over 70 years later, it is time to modernize the legislation to be more in line with current realities. It is clear that the security concerns of today are different from those of the Second World War era when the Public Works Protection Act was adopted.

In light of the transpiration of events during the federal G20 event and the application of the Public Works Protection Act, our government took action to evaluate the use of this legislation and ensure it fit with modern-day applications.

The use of the Public Works Protection Act—the need to safeguard public works and the need to protect civil rights of all Ontarians—does not strike the right balance, and therefore will be replaced by the new bill.

There was significant concern amongst the public that the civil rights of many were ignored on the basis of the old bill at the 2010 G20 summit. The G20 was a federal event held in Toronto. The G20 was led by the Harper Conservatives through the direction of the Prime Minister's office. After considering other sites, including Exhibition Place, the location preferred by the city of Toronto, the federal government decided the G20 summit would be held in the downtown. The Harper Conservatives gave Huntsville two years to prepare security for the G8, but only gave Toronto four months to come up with a security plan.

When you're bringing in that many foreign heads of state and trying to ensure their safety, there are some distinct challenges. G8s and G20s typically attract a high level of attention from individuals and groups lobbying to have their issues heard. The heart of the downtown core of Toronto is home to many businesses, large companies and individuals who call it home. There is a definite challenge, not only to ensure civil order, but also to properly control and contain all activities taking place, whether legal or illegal.

These summits are accompanied by significant groups of protesters, as well as many people who do not agree with the way our governments are acting, and protests against these summits is a healthy occurrence. In addition to the normal protests are criminal elements who are organized to cause damage.

The Canadian Civil Liberties Association has said that the federal government is responsible for the G20 problems. They were quoted as saying, "What is needed is a comprehensive review that can examine the decisions and policies of all of the actors involved in the G20. The G20 was a federal summit, hosted by the federal government, policed by a federal security agency and paid for by federal funds."

The federal government, in allowing insufficient preparation and time for an event which historically results in hoodlum-type demonstrations and damages, placed our police forces in a difficult situation, and the PWPA resulted in a mass overriding of peaceful protesters' civil rights. I think there's agreement on all sides on that.

Shortly after the G20, our government tasked former Chief Justice Roy McMurtry to provide a report on the scope and appropriateness of the PWPA. Justice McMurtry recommended the repeal of the PWPA after potential security gaps were considered. Justice McMurtry was requested to review the PWPA legislation and arrived at the conclusion that there was no need for general purpose public order policing legislation.

Civil liberties groups, municipalities, justice officials, police, power generation stakeholders and the public were all consulted in drafting this legislation. Justice McMurtry's recommendation to repeal the PWPA focused on balancing personal liberties and public safety.

#### 1340

In its current form, the PWPA provides a broad definition of public works, including:

- railways and other transportation infrastructure, public buildings, electricity generating facilities etc., and the ability to designate additional works as public works;
- the ability to appoint guards with the powers of a peace officer for the purpose of protecting a public work;
- additional powers for guards or peace officers to demand identification, conduct warrantless searches and refuse permission to a public work;
- the use of force to exclude a person from public works;
- that it is an offence to refuse to comply with a request or direction of a guard or peace officer under the act.

The PWPA has not been used extensively, and the act is relied on only in limited circumstances. It provides a legal foundation for enhanced security measures without a warrant, particularly routine searches at courthouses. This is a widely recognized and accepted security practice based on known risks that are associated with court proceedings.

The Public Works Protection Act is also used by security personnel at nuclear facilities. The peace officer status conferred on security personnel under the PWPA supports their authority to carry firearms and is used as authority for providing security in the controlled area of a nuclear facility premises. Other power facilities, the Ontario Legislature and other government buildings sometimes rely on the PWPA to empower guards to perform searches without a warrant.

Introducing modern, focused rules for protecting courts, nuclear and other power facilities, while also protecting the civil rights of all Ontarians, is what we are focused on with this new legislation. The Security for Courts, Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act repeals the PWPA. The proposed legislation amends the Police Services Act to provide for court security. It will require any person entering or inside a courthouse to produce identification and provide information to assess their security risk. It allows for search, without a warrant, of any person, property or vehicle entering or attempting to enter premises where court proceedings are conducted.

It allows peace officers to search without a warrant, and use reasonable force if necessary, any person who is in custody where court proceedings are conducted or who is being transported to or from such premises, or any property in the custody/care of that person. It does not compel a person attempting to enter a courthouse to a search, to produce identification or to provide information. They can simply choose to walk away. In this way, we are giving citizens a choice if they want to have their personal information shared.

If they persist in entering the courthouse after refusing to provide information or submit to a search, court security personnel can refuse entry and/or demand that a person leave the premises. They may also use reasonable force, if necessary, to exclude or remove a person. If a person tries to enter and/or refuses to leave, they could be arrested. It establishes offences and penalties for those breaking laws or creating an issue. It is important for court security guards to have these types of laws to support them. This will help ensure the safety and security of courthouses and those who attend them.

Violent incidents, including murder, have occurred in Ontario courthouses in the past. The proposed measures will help to prevent these kinds of incidents in the future. When Ontarians enter our courthouses, there is an implicit sense that they will be safe and protected, and this legislation will ensure that that level of safety and security can be maintained.

Searches at courthouses undertaken pursuant to the PWPA were upheld as constitutional by the Ontario Court of Appeal in 2005, in the case of Campanella.

In terms of electricity generating facilities and nuclear facilities, the legislation applies to prescribed electricity generation facilities and nuclear facilities. It designates security personnel at these facilities as peace officers with a specific set of powers. They can request any person who wishes to enter or who is on their premises to produce identification and provide information for the purposes of assessing the person's security risk. It grants them the power to search, upon consent, any person, property or vehicle entering or on the premises.

The legislation does not replicate the power in the Public Works Protection Act that gives guards the authority to exercise their power in the approaches to the public work. Mr. McMurtry and civil liberties groups identified this language as too vague and too hard to define. This proposed legislation will only allow the specified powers to be exercised on the premises.

We are proposing specific authorities to secure Ontario's power plants based on the unique nature of these facilities in Ontario. Ontario nuclear plants are generally located closer to populated areas, and they therefore need a different measure of protection. Ontarians living near these plants expect to be protected.

Should an emergency occur and public safety and security could potentially be compromised, residents need to be assured that their homes and communities will not be endangered. We have developed this approach based on in-depth discussion and consultation with the nuclear industry, law enforcement and civil liberties groups, all of whom recognize the need for measures to ensure the security of Ontario's nuclear facilities.

If other infrastructure is identified in the future that should be included in the act, it would require a legislative amendment, consistent with Justice McMurtry's recommendations and with what we have heard from civil liberties groups.

Because the list of infrastructure is quite limited and the content of any proposed amendments is subject to public debate, we are working to ensure transparency in the use and scope of this act.

The ministry has also implemented a public notification protocol when police powers are amended by regulation, to ensure adequate time for public review and input prior to passage.

While Mr. McMurtry suggested that the federal government should regulate security at nuclear facilities, and we agree with him that that would be the ideal solution, we have not had a comprehensive federal response as yet. We have approached the federal government to determine its interest in creating the appropriate legislation or regulatory authority for security measures. However, they are unable at this time to fully address these issues in federal statute.

We have therefore developed legislation that proposes a made-in-Ontario solution. We will maintain open channels of community with the federal government and look forward to working with them to develop a federal solution in the future.

Justice McMurtry reported that there is no need for general-purpose public order policing legislation—the

way police manage mass demonstrations and protests. Common law police powers are based on case law and provide police with sufficient authorities if a breach of the peace is imminent.

This government is committed to addressing security needs for an event like the G20 and will work with others to ensure that appropriate measures are in place if another event like this is arranged in Ontario.

The police have the required powers to manage mass demonstrations. Common law police powers are based in case law and provide police with sufficient authorities if a breach of the peace is imminent.

We're the first Canadian jurisdiction to put in place specific legislation, but following discussions and consultation with the nuclear industry, law enforcement and civil liberties groups, all recognized the need for measures to ensure the security of Ontario's nuclear facilities.

This legislation will ensure that Ontario's nuclear facilities, electricity generating plants and courthouses will be better protected. It is more modernized, transparent and focused on security that is necessary.

As Minister Meilleur stated when this new legislation was proposed, it will "achieve the important balance between protecting critical facilities and civil liberties."

Many people contacted my office after the G20 mess, concerned about the trampling of civil rights. I'm sure most members of this Legislature received those complaints. It was recognized that we had to do things differently, and this is what this bill is all about. It will protect people's civil rights. When these leaders come to our cities, or other cities in the world, there are always many people who are against globalization or are against many of the issues that these leaders bring along with them. So we have to make sure those peaceful protests can occur, and we have to protect the civil rights of people who just want to protest.

Ontario does not wish to see a similar situation arise in the future where people expressing their views in a proper manner are subjected to an obvious overreaction from police and the loss of their civil rights.

The PWPA was enacted over 70 years ago, in a war against the Nazis. The legislation was used in a different era, when it was not needed. The new legislation is very specific to a few situations. It is important to safeguard our courts and our electricity generating stations, and will not be used again where our policing powers are sufficient to protect property and people.

Mr. Speaker, I too believe that this legislation will allow for better safety and security for our courts and nuclear and electricity-generating facilities while balancing the important rights and responsibilities of the public.

I thank you, Speaker, for this. I'd just like to quote from the statement made by Madame Meilleur when she was bringing this bill in: "Our government recognizes that we have a responsibility to ensure that our courts and critical infrastructure are protected; however, we must always balance the need for security with a respect for

civil liberties like the freedom of assembly and the principles of an open and transparent justice system. I believe that this legislation does indeed strike that necessary balance."

1350

I urge all my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments.

**Mr. Bill Walker:** I'm pleased to stand and comment after my colleague across the floor, Mr. McNeely from Ottawa—Orléans

I'm very pleased, as I have Bruce Power in my backyard, to support the safety and security of such a significant facility in my riding.

It's unfortunate, though, that Bruce Power actually felt the need to put their own security system in to ensure that that system was there in place. I'm also pleased to say that they are international award-winning with their security services.

I also proudly and equally support the need for security in courts in Owen Sound, where a good friend of mine, Clayton Conlan, was just appointed to the bench. This is notwithstanding, though, that the Liberals have closed both of our jail facilities in Owen Sound and neighbouring Walkerton, and we still wait for facts and figures that will support that this decision is going to be to the benefit of the Ontario taxpayer. They continue to tell us that there are savings associated and this was a necessity, but we get no answers when we ask the question: "Show us the numbers, show us the savings and that this will provide better service." It was hastily executed and poorly planned.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague across said that we need to respect civil rights and democracy. I would suggest that it's confusing, because when we come to the Green Energy Act, they do not listen to the people of Ontario. They have resoundingly, in fact, not listened to the people of Ontario who have stood up and said, "We do not want wind energy to go through at this current time. We want a moratorium. All we're asking is to hold the line and allow us to go there."

Mr. Speaker, it's imperative that a sound security program is delivered in a cost-effective manner. We cannot have endless administration and bureaucracy that's going to add to the cost, like many of the other things that the Liberals on the other side of the House have done of recent. I would suggest to you the arbitration laws that they have invoked—it's something that we cannot afford; the taxpayer of Ontario cannot afford to pay. However, we do support good security in these vital facilities.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** I'll speak directly to the bill at hand, as I have, as well as my colleagues on our side of the benches. I've spoken with some measure of hesitation and offered some suggestions about how this bill may indeed be better or actually may impact some of the more fundamental aspects of our legal system, particularly

when it comes to presenting the powers under the PWPA to security guards in courtrooms. We question some of the extensions of those powers and the limits to which security officers will be able to go to retrieve information, to demand identification, to impede upon the public and their access to our provincial courts, all in the name of security.

As my colleague from Bramalea–Gore–Malton rightly pointed out, it is under the auspices of security and terrorism that typically our rights begin to be infringed upon. Of course, we know that this bill comes about—we think—from a black mark on this government's history in dealing with the G20 here in Toronto, where rights were infringed. Democratic rights to assemble and to protest were infringed upon by this government under the cloak of secrecy, in the dark of night, where a secret aspect of this bill was passed without the knowledge of the broader public and really without knowledge to those police forces that had the responsibility to enact it or to enforce it.

So we hope that some of those concerns will be highlighted and, of course, addressed by this government, but we are thankful that we are in a position where the majority of this House has the ability to provide that insight and oversight so that we don't make the same mistakes twice.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mrs. Liz Sandals:** I'm pleased to speak in support of Bill 34, the Public Works Protection Act, and I guess to thank former Chief Justice Roy McMurtry for the work that he did looking into the whole issue around the G20 and the Public Works Protection Act and how we modernize that, how we provide for better, more current security regulations, and also to thank Madeleine Meilleur, the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services, who has brought us the act and done the follow-up work on following along after Mr. McMurtry's advice.

I think this has been a really, really difficult issue, because there is no doubt that there were legitimate security concerns. In fact, I happen to come from a city where one of the people who actually ended up in jail as a result of behaviour at the G20 lives, and there's another person awaiting sentencing who also, from time to time, lives in my riding. So we have seen in my riding that end of it where there have been legitimate concerns, and we do need to have law that will take care of those legitimate security concerns. But I also have constituents who are at the other end of the spectrum, who were wanting to legitimately engage in political protests and were not looking to engage in acts of vandalism.

So it's finding that proper balance between those who are engaging in deliberate thuggery and those who are engaging in political protest, and being able to better sort out those two. I think, with this bill, we have obtained a better balance.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** We have time for one last question and comment. I recognize the member for Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry.

**Mr. Jim McDonell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Back as a summer job, I had the benefit of working at the Bruce Power facility and saw just how immense it was and the issues that of course have been changed over the day. I realize that there is a critical importance to make sure legislation deals with the security around these normal power stations and, of course, our courts that are there to guarantee our rights. But, of course, the courts are there to protect us and not to allow legislation like this that is set there to sometimes squash the people it's there to protect.

I look at what happened at the G20, and I don't think there's any excuse. This legislation must balance, of course, the needs of looking after the critical infrastructure of Ontario, but it also has to balance the rights of people. It must be clear and it must be well-known just what those rules are. They can't be secret, as we saw in that legislation where legislation is enacted behind closed doors, published so basically it becomes known to the public after the event itself. There were people who were there to do the right thing—in fact didn't know what rules they were actually trying to voice their displeasure with what was going on.

I would ask that the government opposite be careful with their legislation. Of course, there is a need to protect public infrastructure. But, more importantly in a democracy like our own it's very important to look after the needs of its people to ensure that democracy survives a millennium and not be squashed with the simple excuse that was used that day. Thank you for that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** That concludes the time for questions and comments. I'll return now to the member for Ottawa–Orléans, if he chooses to reply.

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** Thank you, Speaker. I want to thank the members from Bruce–Grey–Owen Sound, Essex, Guelph and Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry for their comments on this legislation.

We are all in this House in agreement that the use of the Public Works Protection Act, which is an old act, resulted in a lot that happened that was against the civil rights of a lot of individuals in this province during the G20 conference. We all knew that something had gone wrong. It was important for our government to bring in Mr. McMurtry to review the PWP Act and look at it. He has come through with a good balance between civil rights and protecting our courts, our nuclear facilities, our electrical-generating facilities. Other issues, through legislation, can be added to the list.

**1400**

We had to move forward with changes. I had a lot of calls in my community of Ottawa–Orléans. One of the members of my association, Lorraine DeVanthey, was after me for several weeks to get some answers for her, and the answers weren't coming quickly because we were looking for what the solutions should be. I think we found the proper balance, we found the proper solution, with the assistance of Mr. McMurtry and discussions with many of the civil rights groups and the operators of the facilities.

I hope that all members of this House are in agreement that this legislation should be brought forward and we will be protecting all Ontarians.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Further debate?

**Mr. Jim McDonell:** It is with interest that I read the report from André Marin, the Ontario Ombudsman, called *Caught in the Act*. I think the report talks about the secretive and unparliamentary actions of this Liberal government concerning the G20. I submit that these issues are not restricted to just this event but can be seen in other events across the province, and I'll get back to those later on.

Originally, "liberal" was used to describe a person who was committed to individual liberty and economic freedom. How things have changed under this government, when the vocal civil liberty advocates sit on the PC side of the House, as you see here. The party opposite has forgotten its mandate and has forgotten the very people it has been charged to protect.

The effect of regulation 233/10, now expired, was to infringe on freedom of expression in ways that do not seem justifiable in a free and democratic society. It was an example of extravagant police authority, powers that are unfamiliar in a free and democratic society. These problems should have been apparent. Given the tremendous power that regulation 233/10 conferred on the police, sober and considered reflection should have been given to whether it was appropriate to arm officers with such authority, but this was not done. The passage of the regulation should have been aggressively publicized, not disclosed only through obscure information channels and publicly disclosed after the event happened. The government passed regulation 233/10 in a closed-door session and only published it on e-Laws, where only a few lawyers and researchers and political assistants go. The Ontario Gazette would have come out only in early July with the regulation. In this case, although it received formal approval on June 3, it was not filed with the registrar until June 14. It took two more days for the regulations to be posted on these sites, clearly in the interests of not letting the public know what laws they would be under during this major event in Ontario, an event that should have been a highlight in our history.

It acted as a trap for responsible people. Those who took the time to educate themselves about police powers before setting out to express legitimate public dissent were caught in the trap. This is not an isolated case of citizens, sometimes well versed in lawyer-speak, being one-upped by the same laws that are there to protect them. Look at similar talk that is only there to mislead the public: things such as tuition cuts are promoted to help all students but in fact only are available to less than 10% of the student population in many universities such as Western and Queen's; the Green Energy Act, which is being promoted as a way of sponsoring tens of thousands of jobs, but as the Auditor General reports, the government must tell the people the real cost to Ontario, a cost that has made our manufacturers leave this province, a

cost that has made Ontario uncompetitive, a cost that is forcing our seniors from their homes, a cost that the auditor reports will increase over 40% over the next five years, and a cost that, the Financial Post stated just last week, at the end of next year will be the highest in North America. This is particularly sad when you consider that not too many years ago we were one of the lowest in North America. I think it's time for information to be out there so that people actually know, when they're voting the next time, the real cost this is to the public.

So the question comes, why did the government pass such a law? The Public Works Protection Act was a war-measures-designed act to protect infrastructure, not provide security to individuals. This is an act that was not required, as common law and the statutory authority of police officers would have been ample to screen and prevent entry to those who might pose a threat to G20 participants. Simply put, regulation 233/10 was of dubious legality and was not required.

Over 1,000 arrests were made during the G20 protests. Fewer than 100 charges were filed under the Police Services Act, and only two under the Public Works Protection Act itself, a clear indication that it was not needed.

Dalton McGuinty was asked by Toronto's police chief for powers under the Public Works Protection Act, and he simply handed over everything to them and went on vacation. The Premier folded on the issue of liberty as easily as he had in labour bargaining in the past. He's folded so much that he's the political equivalent of an origami paper swan.

John Yakabuski insisted there was no such request, but the police chief did ask for support in ensuring order and security, in which case the government made an attempt at being seen to be doing something—something they're very good at—but gave no thought to the potential consequences, the reasonableness or the actual need for the law, just as they did with the pit bull law, where they came out to look at quieting a few and put in a law that really was not fair to the masses.

This government lets itself be manipulated by everyone's priorities. The Premier watched the sitcom *Yes Minister* and made his motto, "I am their leader; I must follow them." It's no leadership if the government can't exercise moderation or soberly reflect on the need for or consequences of legislation they enact. A true leader doesn't pass the buck and blame somebody else for their own mistakes. They accept responsibility, express contrition and take action to right what's wrong.

This isn't the first time this government has played around with police powers—the power of the state to enforce the laws of the land. They hand it out to anyone who isn't too lazy to ask. Look at the OSPCA act, where we have untrained people going into agricultural areas, where they have no training and should not have jurisdiction, and enforcing huge fines.

The government has laudable intentions in passing this regulation. We are talking much about a wartime act. Neville Chamberlain had good intentions too, and it turned into a disaster.

There are many consequences. Police exercised their rights under the act well beyond the limits of the security perimeter, even after the misinterpretation on the part of the chief of the Toronto Police had been corrected. Apart from the insiders of the government of Ontario, only members of the Toronto Police Services knew that the rules of the game had changed, and they were the ones holding the deck of go-to-jail cards.

By noon on Saturday, June 26, communications between the integrated security unit in Barrie—which was in charge of overall security—and Toronto Police Services had broken down, so those messages did not get to people who were actually in charge of security.

If we were to believe the allegations and witness accounts in the *Toronto Star*, officers may have been under the impression that marshal law had been declared and the breadth of powers conferred in the act could quite fit the description of marshal law.

The five-metre rule had been clarified—it applied to a patch of land and a parking lot—and this clarification was lost in communications. So police were arresting people on streets that were not designated as public works.

The government hid the regulation from the Legislature while the assembly was in session. The government made every effort to keep the regulation out of public view and submitted it late for publication in the *gazette*. The government did not inform stakeholders about the regulation. When pressed for details, the government went AWOL, hoping the problem would go away. No one accepted responsibility.

1410

But sadly, these abuses aren't limited to things such as the G20 summit. I would like to highlight some of the issues that I have seen as abuse of civil liberties.

For years, I've been travelling to Queen's University for a yearly homecoming, and I'd like to highlight some of the issues I've seen there. I've seen police enter private residences and make arrests and confiscate alcohol without warrants. I have a son who attended university there who told me that they can no longer post their gatherings on Facebook because they are reviewed by the police and, again, they show up.

I could talk about one event we planned as an alumni group going back after 30 years. We had planned a party one Saturday morning at 9 o'clock to meet with upperclassmen. When we arrived, the police had already been there, had charged them and had confiscated some alcohol that we had bought for the event. I mean, this is something they saw because we had handed out letters inviting our upperclassmen. These are people, like myself, over 50 years old, and I just wonder what threat we would be, that these are the things that go on.

Travelling down streets, I've seen vans pull up to the sidewalk, pull somebody into them and leave—unmarked police vans.

Students are learning that this is an area where the laws can be interpreted and misused. They've resorted now to public gatherings in the streets that have caused

huge issues. I've been there to see riot police trying to take on 2,000 or 3,000 students who are unarmed, sitting there, and, of course, by their assembly, being man-handled, forced to the ground and pulled away.

These are things that can happen when we let the authority go awry, and I think it's time for this government to look at some of the things going on in the province. These things are well documented. In this case here, it's turned the university and the students to cancel their homecoming.

I bring this up because it's areas where, over the years, I've seen the laws get progressively worse, where you walk down the street—I know that maybe I look like a threat, but three people of my age being told that if we don't move along, we'll be arrested. This is just an example of some of the things that we see in Toronto, but on a much greater scale.

I think it's time—

*Interjections.*

**Mr. Jim McDonell:** Actually, I'd like to say that possibly the Attorney General wasn't aware, but he was there very publicly one night, handing out water, so I know that he's aware of what's going on there.

But as I say, going back to some of the events I've seen, I also was involved in the War Measures Act in 1970, growing up along the border. I know it was federally enacted legislation, where, in a simple act of 16-year-olds going to play hockey, they were forced to stop twice each way, going and coming home, just to have their hockey bags searched. These were liberties at the time—there's some merit in them, but you've got to look at the overall, what it's doing. For the local people who lived along the border, it was a huge impediment to our ability to act and function in a normal manner. In those days, we were just trying to live and, I guess, as I said, go and play hockey.

I think that it's time for this government to come clean and tell the people of Ontario just what it needs to hear. I commend my seatmate from Cambridge today, Rob Leone, when he was attempting to get some direction on just where our hospital spending is going, something that I've heard for the past three elections—commitments. People who in 2003 were promised hospitals are still, in 2012, today, asking, "When? Where?" I see the resistance from the government here to actually answer that question. How long does it take to get those answers?

I brought up the tuition that the students of Ontario are fighting for. They wanted this cut because we were the highest tuition rates, in Ontario, only to be promised—this legislation comes back and we see the results, where less than 10% of the students actually qualify, for one reason or another. It's something that I get questioned on almost daily from students in our riding. They come forth and say, "Look, I read about this application but I don't qualify. Why? I'm a student from your riding," but maybe they go to McGill. There just seems to be too many reasons. "I didn't complete my undergrad in the minimum number of years." We're looking for reasons not to give out the grants, instead of, you know—open,

transparent legislation that everybody was supporting gone awry.

It's time for the government to come clean, and it's time to look at what they're trying to do. There are admirable reasons to protect our infrastructure. We've all seen cases in other countries that we don't want to see here, where infrastructure is severely impacted and destroyed because legislation is not there, but it is not an excuse to trample the rights of the individual. I implore the government to work with us and come up with a happy mix, look at the legislation that exists today where it's being abused and look for ways that we can actually improve and make a difference going forward and make living in Ontario just like it used to be.

We look at the cover-ups that we see or the incidents with Ornge where we're hoping the party opposite will join the opposition that has shown solidarity in trying to get to the bottom of this and protecting the employees who have been threatened with jail time if they come to us with information. We don't feel that's in the interests of the public of Ontario. We've heard some of the abuses, whether it be today with the rotors on these aircraft that are falling off, but this should not be something that comes across to us in a sealed envelope with no name on it because people are afraid to really do their part in this democracy and give us the tools we need. We haven't got a commitment, but we're looking forward to this government trying to get to the bottom of this and for it to come out.

Sure, there's some bad news in it, but that bad news needs to be put out and the right people need to go to jail. The public is asking for these scandals to be behind us, and I think this is an opportunity for us to show the public just how serious we are. We all know that some serious wrongdoing occurred here. It was identified more than a year ago, and I guess at that time—it wouldn't be the scandal it is today if it had been acted upon.

One has to wonder about the merits. Why was this suppressed for so long? Why was the Auditor General barred from finding out information until only after the election? I have my feelings on it, and I think the public do. Perception is everything, and I think it's our job now to come through and show the public that we're serious, whether it be on this or just the civil liberties that we saw in Toronto, and come back afterwards on this incident in Toronto where we say, "Well, obviously the legislation was misunderstood."

I guess it's no wonder when legislation is passed and not vetted and people have not had the chance to look at it. As to the timeliness of it, I don't believe the Toronto police had time to really look at it and absorb what was being done here. Obviously there were misinterpretations. It's interesting to note that the group that was in charge of overall security was not aware of it as well. We're lucky nothing happened, but there was a lot that happened in the realm of civil liberties. I think Canada, which likes to be out in the forefront and promote itself as being somebody that's a leader in democracies around the world, is embarrassed by this, and I don't think we want to see this happen again.

We're looking forward to seeing this legislation actually take steps to make sure that some of the acts that we see where people are dressed up and go and do damage—those are the people we really want to get, but we don't want to get the people who are standing by or, in one case, somebody going down to purchase some milk who didn't have their wallet or ID on them and was arrested. These are cases where it's almost too embarrassing to bring it up here—or the amputee, where his leg was removed and he was charged. There has to be some common sense applied to this. I would hope that the people of Ontario are quite embarrassed by those events, because they truly are something to be embarrassed about. I truly hope that there was an apology sent to the amputee who was put through that. I know mistakes can be made, but when things got that far into that arrest, surely cooler heads should have prevailed. People should have realized that he was not a threat, helped the person and, I would think, called paramedics in to help him out. No, we called in the paddy wagon and sent him to jail. It's truly the wrong message to send out.

Now that we have a good mix from the three parties here to review this, I would hope the government would listen to all sides. I want to thank the Legislature for listening today.

1420

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much for those remarks. Questions and comments?

**Mr. Paul Miller:** Yes, I'd like to commend the member from Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry: good presentation, some genuine concerns that we share with the official opposition.

We are concerned about schedule 2, which gives too much power to court security officers that they don't need. Why should security have the power to ask any individual who wants to enter the courthouse, "Why are you here?" Do they have the power to search their cars in the parking lot? That's a question too.

Schedule 3 has the potential to be misinterpreted by untrained private security officers. Where would the limits of a nuclear facility be made? Would the police be allowed to go into the parking lots or beyond the fences as private security officers to confront possible protesters? We have some concerns there too.

I mean, I saw the pictures of what happened at the G20, and I do believe that the police should have moved in on the people that had the black hoodies and the black handkerchiefs across their face, the ones that were jumping on police cars and setting police cars on fire. They should have moved quickly on Saturday to curtail that. Their built-up frustration showed up on Sunday when they started going after quiet protesters that weren't really the ones that were doing the damage.

It only takes a couple of hundred bad apples to escalate a riot and that's exactly what happened. I do believe the police could have cracked down immediately on those guys. Anyone who had a covering on their face was not there for good deeds; they were there to cause trouble. I think they could have centred some of the

leaders out and got them and put the run to the ones that were supporting those types of individuals.

You know that tempers do flare in these situations, and this situation puts more emphasis on the fact that government needs to be cautious on the curtailment of civil rights and the powers it gives police officers. They certainly have to keep an eye on this because we're very concerned that they will have too much power and more individuals will be injured.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Hon. John Milloy:** I listened with interest to the member from Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry's presentation. What I failed to hear him acknowledge in his remarks is the fact that the G20 and the security around the G20 was a federal responsibility. We're talking about an instance where the government of Canada and the people of Canada were welcoming leaders from around the world, 20 leaders, including the President of the United States, and other targets, which I think we would all realize create a real need for very, very complex security. That security was undertaken by the federal government.

Where I do agree with my honourable friend is in his concluding remarks, where he did acknowledge the fact that the Public Works Protection Act, which we're talking about, is an outmoded act, is one that goes back to the time of the Second World War, and I think all members of this House realize needs to be updated, needs to reflect the modern time.

I want to take a minute and pay tribute to former Chief Justice Roy McMurtry, an outstanding Ontarian, an outstanding Canadian who we asked to take a look at the law. He came forward with a very thoughtful report. Based on that report, based on the consultations that were undertaken by both the present minister and previous minister, we have a piece of legislation before us which balances the needs of security with those of freedom and I think is a very good balance and will go a long way in addressing some of the shortfalls that we saw under the Public Works Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that this legislation has come forward. I'm pleased with the fact that we've heard some positive things from all sides of this House. I think we have to look at an act which is going to meet our security needs and reflect the values of this day and age as we move forward with this piece of legislation.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Toby Barrett:** The member for Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry did make it clear that it was the McGuinty Liberals that secretly revived Ontario's version of the War Measures Act, and I know André Marin made that clear, as was mentioned in his report Caught in the Act. It was another Liberal, Trudeau—we remember that era; some of us do—who in 1970 brought in the War Measures Act. I was living in Simcoe, Ontario, at the time, and a good friend of mine immediately got thrown in jail. This is in Simcoe,

Ontario. I don't think he had ever been to Quebec. This happened to my friend. He was thrown into our local jail because the police had the power to do that—again, courtesy of another Liberal. I think we can probably—

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** At least the jails were open, still.

**Mr. Toby Barrett:** Yeah, at least we had a jail then.

Again, the police have the power, courtesy of Liberals. Here again, after all these years, another Liberal brought in the G20 law, and they kept it secret. We didn't know about this particular law.

So I welcome the comments from the member for Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry. He has done an excellent job in explaining what's going on. This is not surprising. He has a wealth of municipal experience. He just joined this Legislature in the last election. He got something like 54% of the vote, Speaker. I've got the numbers here: 21,615 votes. He beat two people named "MacDonald," carrying on now the good work of Noble Villeneuve, a former Ag minister for that area. He's in there with federal MP Guy Lauzon. So there's a riding down in that part of Ontario that will be looked after very well in the future.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Michael Prue:** I rise to commend the member from Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry for his contribution to this debate. He spoke throughout in a somewhat measured tone, which was a good thing to hear, because there were no histrionics, there was no yelling or anything else. It was just an absolutely measured tone.

He put the blame absolutely where it should have been, and that was on the secrecy of the Liberal government, the secrecy that was there. They went into closed session; they passed a law. We know who was present: not only the cabinet, but a few others I like to call the "hangers-on" around the cabinet, who were also there and who did not voice any displeasure on the passing of this act.

He brought the entire thing back to himself, to his own personal experience, to his days at Queen's University, his returning there as an alumnus and what happened with the university police. Wherever you get an opportunity where power is not measured out wisely and justly, there is always this risk, and he brought it back in very personal terms.

He also concluded by talking about the timeliness of the reports. And one has to ask that selfsame question. There were multiple arrests—I think 1,100 arrests—made during that couple-of-days period here in Toronto. There were stories in the press. There were allegations. There were counter-allegations. There was this government not really knowing what they were saying. There was the police chief of Toronto, who I believe honestly was misinformed about the authorities, and yet it took months and months after the election until pen was actually put to paper to put this all in perspective.

Again, I commend the member for what he brought out today.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** That concludes the time for questions and comments. I'll return to the member for Stormont-Dundas-South Glengarry for his reply.

**Mr. Jim McDonell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank the honourable member who commented on my speech—from Hamilton East-Stoney Creek—talking about the people dressed in black. We see this over and over and over again, whether it be in Vancouver during the Stanley Cup riots or whether it be in Ottawa a few years ago with the last summit that was there, and this week here. We get people who go into these areas dressed in black, cover their faces, and then go in and trash the place. Not only are they the real culprits of the security issue, but they're an embarrassment to the public, and I think we need legislation that looks after those. Truly, if you're in a place like that and you've covered your face, I think your intent is clear.

I think the comment from the House leader—he failed to acknowledge their government's role in this. It is they who enacted the regulation that resulted in these police measures. I think that, from what I hear around the table, everybody can see it was overbearing and inappropriate.

1430

We must not lose sight, as we're saying, of what we're there to do: the security required around that event and not wanting to have a mishap here. But again, there were people there, some of them to protest peacefully, and some of them who just happened to be curious, walking by, and who were caught up in the arrests as well.

The member from Haldimand-Norfolk talked of my predecessor in the riding, Noble Villeneuve, a great member from our riding who went on to be Minister of Agriculture and who provided help to me in my quest for this position.

For Beaches-East York, it's the responsibility of the cabinet to stand up, because that's something that we didn't see here. We didn't see people on that side of the government stand up and say, "We made a mistake." I think that's what we're looking for, and we're looking for things to be addressed, as with many of the other issues around the province.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much. Further debate?

**Mr. Michael Prue:** It is my pleasure and my opportunity here to talk about this bill.

You know, I have been in this Legislature now—this is my eleventh year, and I have heard a great many discussions on a great many bills. It was a surprise to me, coming here every day for the last 11 years, to find out that, in fact, Ontario had a Public Works Protection Act. I thought this was a vestige of the Second World War. I had no idea that it still existed, and I think most Ontarians and most members of this Legislature had no idea that we had such a draconian act that was still on the books. Here it is, an act 70 years old that is suddenly brought forward in a kind of secret way—not a "kind of"; a totally secret way—and enacted upon the people of Ontario.

A few people have already commented that this was Ontario's version of the War Measures Act, and it probably pretty closely approximates exactly that. They're both about the same age; they were both intended for the same purpose. One was designed federally and would take effect all across Canada; the other one was more specific to this province. But the intent was exactly the same. The intent at the time, in 1939, was to make sure that Canada did not find itself in a situation where its infrastructure could be harmed, bombed or destroyed. People in their good judgment in those days did what they thought was necessary to protect this great country.

But I remember—I guess I'm old enough to remember—the War Measures Act. I remember when it was enacted in 1970. I remember where I was and what was happening. I remember looking in horror at the death of Pierre Laporte on the television and the kidnappings, and what was happening in Quebec and in Montreal, with the tanks going up and down the streets and the armed guards and the army that were called in. But I also remember in horror when our Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau, when questioned about this, said, "Just watch me." Then he brought forward a draconian act and saw the civil liberties of thousands of people compromised.

The reason it all comes home to me, Mr. Speaker, is because I was a university student at that time. I was very involved in political life, both on the campus and in the broader society, both municipally and provincially—and federally as well. I was involved in all of those things, and I was very curious as to why the War Measures Act would be invoked.

I went to a public lecture at the University of Toronto. One of the speakers at the University of Toronto was the principal of Scarborough College. His name was Wynne Plumptre. He has been deceased for many years, but Wynne Plumptre was a wonderful man. I knew him fairly well, and he was one of the key speakers talking about the War Measures Act because he had first-hand knowledge. During the Second World War, as a senior federal bureaucrat, part of the job that he did was to invoke the War Measures Act. Part of the job that he was responsible for was taking those poor Japanese Canadians away from their livelihoods, their boats and their homes in British Columbia, and moving them inland into Ontario, Manitoba and other places. For what purpose?

I remember when he stood there in front of the lectern and talked to a packed audience of maybe 1,000 University of Toronto students—some of whom supported the War Measures Act, some of whom did not—and how he spoke to us about how this was a blunt tool and a blunt instrument and it ought not to be taking place.

He spoke with such eloquence and such passion that he convinced me. But he didn't convince everyone in the room, because, Mr. Speaker, in that room taking the pictures of every single one of the 1,000 students who were there for a learning exercise, to hear the pros and cons of the War Measures Act, were police officers, taking all of our pictures. I remember that. I remember

downtown Toronto, having my picture taken for being at a public lecture theatre listening to the pros and cons of the War Measures Act. That never, ever has escaped my mind, because to this day, I know how easy it is for someone's civil liberties to be taken away.

I knew even more a couple of nights later, when I was having a beer with my friends, and one of my friends drank a little bit too much and I was telling her why I thought Wynne Plumptre was right. When I left that night, the newflash came across the radio and the television that they had found the body of Pierre Laporte. She phoned the police on me. Luckily, luckily, her friend hung it up just before she had to give all the pertinent details. I guess I was saved from being arrested, because that's all it took; somebody drinking a little bit too much and my defence of civil liberties would have caused that.

So when I see what this government did around G20, I have to ask: What was this cabinet thinking? What were the cabinet and the hanger's on around the cabinet table thinking when they invoked the equivalent of the War Measures Act? Anybody in this country, anybody of any renown—Roy McMurtry, any civil rights official, any lawyer—will tell you that what happened in 1970 was way overblown for what was necessary. Yes, we needed to call in the army; yes, we needed to ensure that people's lives were not compromised, but we did not have to throw hundreds and thousands of people in jail then, nor did we have to throw the 1,100 in jail in this past year.

There is no rational reason why such an act would have been used. There were other instruments available to this government, even if it was on short notice. There were other things that could have been done. There were other warnings that could have been made to make sure that innocent people were not caught up in what happened in downtown Toronto.

This government is absolutely complicit in its own passing of this regulation. They did so in private. They did so without consulting the people of Ontario. They did so without notifying the people of Ontario. They did so without detailing the provisions. Some 1,100 people were arrested, most without cause, and most of those charges have been withdrawn.

There were 20,000 police officers in the downtown core during these couple of days, and those officers, in and of themselves, should have been sufficient. Now, it's just not me who thinks this, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to make two quotes—they may have been quoted before, but I think they need to be quoted again.

The first is from the Canadian Civil Liberties Association. They had this to say about government action during the G20: "The conditions for some of the policing problems that were experienced during the summit were set during the preparatory stage.... For example, the lack of transparency surrounding the designation of the security perimeter as a 'public work' led to misunderstandings as to the scope of search and seizure powers and, in our view, to an inappropriate use of these powers. The large number of police officers during the week

leading to the G20 generated both a suspicion of wasted resources and a sentiment of potential intimidation. June 26 represents a turning point. Widespread property damage was committed by a cohort of vandals in the downtown of Toronto on that day. We condemn this criminal activity and acknowledge that it warranted a response by police. The response police provided, however, was unprecedented, disproportionate and, at times, unconstitutional."

1440

The Ombudsman, André Marin, in his report, stated, "Regulation 233/10, passed to enhance security during the G20 summit, should never have been enacted. It was likely unconstitutional. The effect of regulation 233/10, now expired, was to infringe on freedom of expression in ways that do not seem justifiable in a free and democratic society. Specifically, the passage of the regulation triggered the extravagant police authority found in the Public Works Protection Act, including the power to arbitrarily arrest and detain people and to engage in unreasonable searches and seizures. Even apart from the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the legality of regulation 233/10 is doubtful. The Public Works Protection Act under which it was proclaimed authorizes regulations to be created to protect infrastructure, not to provide security to people during events. Regulation 233/10 was therefore probably invalid for having exceeded the authority of the enactment under which it was passed. These problems should have been apparent, and given the tremendous power regulation 233/10 conferred on the police, sober and considered reflection should have been given to whether it was appropriate to arm officers with such authority. This was not done. The decision of the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services to sponsor..."

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is better than the bill it's replacing. If for that reason and only that reason, I would find it hard not to support it, because I do not want to leave a bill such as the 1939 act, which was invoked by this government in its last session, to be used ever again upon the people of this province. It was untoward, it was unnecessary, and it was brutal.

Having said that, there are some problems even with this bill. As a person who takes his civil liberties very seriously and who wants civil liberties for all of the citizens of this province and of this country, I think we need to look very carefully at any bill that will impinge upon any of those—violations of those rights which Canadians believe they inherently have.

The first section is that of the courts. You look upon what can happen—and it doesn't say this is going to happen in any courtroom, but it says it can happen any time the government invokes this act. So any time the government feels that things are looking a little nasty or that a circumstance might warrant it and invokes any portion of this act, then in the courts, any person entering a court must produce identification.

Now, I know that a great many people attend courts. I used to work in the immigration department; I used to

attend court, too. We used to attend court if there was a foreign national who was facing a criminal charge to see whether or not they pled guilty or whether, in fact, they were convicted. I don't remember ever once being asked in the courtroom to produce identification as to who I was and why I was there. I'm wondering: Is this now going to be the norm when one goes into a courtroom, to produce identification? Is it going to be the norm that if you are going down to watch a trial, you have to produce identification to get into the courtroom? I hope not because this is a public place, and citizens should have an unfettered right to attend courts. That is what makes them open and transparent, and the intimidation of being forced to show identification may deter some from doing what has been taken as a right until this point.

The second point is that any person must provide information and be questioned as to the purpose of their being there. They could be there as moral support for an accused. They could be there as friends or family of the victim. They could be there purely out of interest. They could be there for any number of reasons. But if this passes, then there is always the possibility that people will be asked any number of questions—anything from their political activities to their religion, to their knowledge of the accused or of the families or of the victims, and I'm not sure that that is something that we should be impinging upon.

The next thing that would happen, or could potentially happen, is that they could be searched without warrant; that is, any person can be searched without warrant, as, as well, can the property or vehicle of any person who seeks to enter a courtroom. I wonder if this is something that this government intends to do, because although this is better than the blunt instrument of the 1939 law, it still goes further than I think we expect in a free and democratic society.

I note as well that any person who is in custody can be searched without warrant. Any person in custody at all, when they come from the jail, can be searched without warrant. Although there may not be a great public appetite for people who have been charged with an offence to be given any kind of fair treatment at all, I think when their civil liberties are most at risk is when they are in custody facing a trial and are about to be searched. I can imagine there may be some considerable ill feeling when that takes place.

Those are the things in court. I don't know whether they're going to pass, and I hope that they will be subject to amendment when and if this goes to committee, because this needs to be looked at. I acknowledge that this will not happen in every court proceeding; it will not even happen in every court. But it will happen from time to time when those powers are invoked for whatever reason. And we, in a free and democratic society, ought to make sure that this is exercised with the utmost of care or not at all, and it should be the exception rather than the rule. We do not need to go down that particular path.

The only thing I would agree with—and I think most sensible people would—is the right of search or at least the right of going through a metal detector. I do know, in

this very building—and all the members and anybody who has ever been in the back room or sat up on this particular section of the Legislature behind me knows—that there is a metal detector similar to what one would find often in a courthouse, in a Parliament building, in any kind of police station, in an airport; sometimes in some train stations around the world you go through a metal detector. I would have no real umbrage with that. I think that that's important, given sometimes the emotions of the day. You don't want people coming in taking justice or the law into their own hands, and so passing through a metal detector, that kind of search, seems eminently reasonable to me. All the others seem just a little bit far-fetched—patting down the person to see what they have with them.

In terms of the electricity and nuclear, this doesn't seem to me to be so onerous, and I can understand being very careful around nuclear establishments. They can be and are dangerous places if someone seeks to do harm to them. Perhaps that's why so many in the NDP think that nuclear stations and nuclear energy is not the way to go. It's just one of many, many reasons. To me, mostly it's the cost. They're all overrun; they all cost so much, it hardly makes it worthwhile. But there is always that possibility as well.

If you go in or near any place that's producing electricity—it's not clear whether this involves a windmill; it's not clear to me whether it involves a solar farm; it's not clear to me whether it involves a generator, be it a gas generator or just a little private generator that produces a few kilowatts of power. If you go anywhere where electricity is being produced, then you can be searched upon consent. You have to give your consent, which is a good thing. So I guess you could just leave—"You're not going to search me," and I leave. But anyone can be refused entry or be forcibly removed if they refuse to submit to a search from any of these facilities.

I do know there was a time when people went to electrical facilities—I went to a few myself, where electricity was being produced. I went down to Niagara Falls to see how it was produced there; I went to the nuclear facility at Pickering to see how it was produced there. Certainly, nobody searched me, and no one suggested that I should be searched. In fact, in the nuclear facilities, as you drive along the 401, you'll see signs up that say that they are open for public inspection, and the public is invited to come and see them, I suppose, to see how safe and modern they are.

1450

I would also suggest to this government and to all the members of this House, when it does go to committee, that if we are going to go down this path, either to the courts or to the electricity or nuclear facilities, that there should be written notices leading up to the front doors, explaining the rights of the security personnel, so that people are not taken aback when their constitutional rights are somehow impinged.

Mr. Speaker, those are the comments I have for today. I reluctantly will be supporting this bill because it's better than the old one, but I still think we're going too far.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** Just to comment on the comments from the member from the NDP: The reason the government has to do this law is not because they want to, or to do the right thing. It's because the Ombudsman pointed it out and embarrassed them. They had to do it.

There is a danger when the government starts making laws behind closed doors that start removing our freedoms, and there's no excuse for a government to do this at any time. My grandparents left Europe because of that reason. They lost too many freedoms from secretive governments. They wanted something that was better for their lives and, of course, it was coming to Ontario.

The government also isn't taking responsibility for this. They're blaming others. I've already heard today they're blaming Stephen Harper. I'm sure Alberta's on the blame, and if we listen long enough, Newfoundland probably has a problem with it.

I quote from Andrea Horwath, from the newspaper here: "NDP leader Andrea Horwath said the new law is an 'admission' of failure on the part of the Liberal government."

"They made a big mistake when they were preparing for the G20 and they're ignoring the fact that mistake trampled people's civil rights, civil liberties...."

It's time this government started taking responsibility for their actions. Say you're sorry and start being accountable and governing this province with pride and not being secretive.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Paul Miller:** I was glad to hear the member from Beaches—East York go down memory lane. It reminds me of the days of the 1960s, and Woodstock, and all the days when people actually got out en masse to protest what was going on in the world. That was the start of civil liberties, in my opinion, when people met by the thousands to voice their opinion on things that weren't right. That was the start of it all.

When these situations are created, tempers flare as the situation escalates, and both sides have a tendency to overreact. But this situation put more emphasis on the fact that the government needs to be cautious of the curtailment of civil rights and of the powers it gives to the police officers. It should be also careful so that it can justify such powers. This was not the case at the G20.

Since Minister Meilleur herself admitted that it was an issue of miscommunication, I would look forward to seeing the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services develop a protocol that would call for public information campaigns when police powers are extended. I would also like to see written notices at the entrances of courthouses and nuclear facilities listing the possible requirements for entry and the consequences of disobeying those requirements.

There also needs to be an accountability mechanism in those instances where things do not go as planned. Security guards and police forces need to fully under-

stand what they can and cannot do. They also need to know the consequences that their actions could elicit.

We have to be extremely careful about what powers we give to the police forces and the private security firms. On the other hand, we have to be extremely careful that the civil rights of the people of this province are protected and innocent people are not retained or held in custody for things that are simply an expression of their feelings and their thoughts about the way government should run.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. David Zimmer:** I'll be speaking to this matter at length for about 20 minutes in the next go-round. But just by way of a two-minuter, I can tell you that I think I'm the only member of this Legislature who actually participated in the G20 demonstrations, albeit I participated by way of observer. I was driving in my car—it was a Saturday afternoon, and I was up around Bloor and Avenue Road—and I heard on the radio about a demonstration in front of Queen's Park. So I slipped down, pulled into my parking spot at the back here and walked around to the front. I was with someone, a guest from out of town whom I was, interestingly enough, showing around the city of Toronto that afternoon.

I walked down close to College, where the police line was, and my sense of the demonstration was—it was really scary at times, and at times peaceful—that there was a hard core of 30 or 40 demonstrators, all dressed in black, and they were creating real chaos at the front of the police lines. Then the vast majority, the rest of us, myself included—they were all ages; there were parents there with young children; there were senior citizens—were watching this, just for same reason I was, to see how this was unfolding—

**Mrs. Liz Sandals:** Curiosity.

**Mr. David Zimmer:** —a mix of curiosity; they might have gone out to actually demonstrate, but in a very peaceful way.

But it was very evident that it was the very small group that was causing the difficulty at the police lines, and they were reacting to that. Of course, it was only a few minutes till everybody got caught up in the chaos, myself included. Fortunately, I beat a hasty retreat back to the parking lot and went home for the afternoon.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** It was a real pleasure to hear from my colleague from Beaches—East York. I think he always contributes a great deal to the debate in this chamber. We may not always agree, but he and I respect one another, to accept what the other is saying. I must say that I was quite compelled to hear the story about him and his friend, and I think it's really valuable that we share those stories about legislation that we have in this chamber from time to time.

Last week, I was in the chamber, as was my colleague from Beaches—East York, when my seatmate, the member from Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, added his

father's experience of having fought in the world war and what the genesis for the previous legislation was and why we needed to change this. I must say that one of my constituents, actually, is the Ombudsman for Ontario, André Marin, and we were talking on Friday, over lunch, about the member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke's speech, because obviously he had cited the Ombudsman's work at that period of time.

All this is to say that I think this piece of legislation actually signifies why we are here: to debate the big issues of the day and to respond. The benefit of this piece of legislation being brought before the House right now in a minority Parliament is that those experiences that our colleagues have felt, or others have felt, can be brought to light to talk about the significance of this legislation.

So I do want to commend my colleague from Beaches–East York for once again bringing some very relevant information to the floor of this chamber. I always really appreciate listening to some of the stories he has to tell, but particularly in the context of the bill that is before us. Thank you, Mr. Prue, from Beaches–East York.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** I'll now return to the member for Beaches–East York for his reply.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** I'd like to thank my colleagues from Elgin–Middlesex–London, Hamilton East–Stoney Creek, Willowdale and Nepean–Carleton for their kind words and their contributions.

I think I should correct the record, though, for the member from Willowdale: He may have happened upon this particular demonstration and stood well back from it, but I do know that my colleague from Parkdale–High Park was there all three days, was actually part of the demonstration, and led, on Sunday, a prayer for those victims. So I think her contribution to what was happening that day far outweighed your own, although I am impressed that you ventured close. It was my own decision not to go down there because I fully expected what was going to happen did happen.

1500

As you may have heard from my own story, just attending a meeting to hear the merits or the demerits of the War Measures Act, I had my picture taken and it almost caused me to be arrested. It was not something that I would lightly attend because of the difficulties.

I do commend my colleague from Parkdale–High Park and I think perhaps other members of the—was Mr. Kormos there, as well? Mr. Kormos was there, as well.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** The member from Davenport, as well.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Yes, Jonah Schein from Davenport was there. He wasn't an MPP at that time, but he was there, as well.

This was a protest against some of the things that are happening in the world, of which people ought to protest. Remember, this was taking place at a time when the banks were collapsing in some countries, when the economic situation was getting horrendous for ordinary

people, when people were looking around the world and looking for solutions and were not seeing it in the G8 or G20 summit. This was a legitimate opportunity for ordinary people to pass comment on this.

I thank the four who passed comment on what I had to say, and I'm looking forward to the member from Willowdale's speech.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Further debate on second reading of Bill 34?

**Mr. David Zimmer:** Let me start off with an apology to my colleague from Parkdale–High Park. Had I known that you were at the demonstration, I would have referenced you in my remarks, and I also would have referenced former MPP for Welland Peter Kormos, who was there. I didn't see them. They were there. It's probably because either I was hiding behind the bushes or perhaps they were hiding behind the bushes. I can say I was being very careful—because I remember I did get right up to the police line. I thought, I'm an MPP, and this is happening in the precinct here, on the grounds.

I have to say I was cautioned by the legislative security here, who were immediately in front of the building where the steps are, watching it. I went down, and they offered me some advice and said, "Mr. Zimmer, I don't think you should go beyond this point. Don't go down there." I think I said, "Well, I want to go down and see what's going on. I'm the MPP." I got right up to the police line, within arm's-length, when I got a poke in the chest with one of those black things, just making it quite clear that I should not come any closer. That's when I backed up.

Having said that, this is a very, very serious matter for civil rights here in Ontario. The great challenge that any government has that is responsible for the well-being, in this case, of 13 million citizens, responsible for the infrastructure and responsible for facilities and so on, is to strike the right balance between those people who want to wreak havoc on our institutions, our buildings, our way of life here in Ontario, and those people who, while they may be critical—and they're well within their rights to be critical. In fact, they're encouraged to be critical, in a constructive way, of actions that governments take or don't take. The point is, there is a proper way to bring forth that criticism. Our citizens in our democratic system are entitled and, indeed, expected—indeed, it is good for the society as a whole when they can forcefully bring forward their criticisms.

Unfortunately, what happens—often there is a minority of people who play on that right, that we all expect, to criticize, to demonstrate forcefully and vocally, and they push it too far. We have to ask ourselves, why do they push it as far as they do? Why do they go beyond the bounds of legality? Why do they go beyond the bounds of what's acceptable? Why, in fact, do they want to go beyond the bounds of what's acceptable? Why, in fact, do they want to go beyond the bounds of what is persuasive? Because sometimes a demonstration, like the issues we had of people burning police cars and so on, is so far over the top that it's counterproductive. Reason-

able people who are following the debate and who want to hear what the demonstrators have to legitimately say, those who are critical of government for this or that or the other thing—and that's fair; they should be heard and they should be listened to. The irony is that people who push it too far shut down the ability of governments or make it impossible for the governments, or make it impossible for the legitimate demonstrators, to get their points across. So they create this chaotic situation which sort of implodes on itself and nobody hears the legitimate criticisms that the reasonable demonstrators want to put forward. That in itself is not good for our democratic model.

Now, the legislation which caused the difficulties during the G20 here, the old PWPA, the Public Works Protection Act, was something that was set in place in 1939. That's 80-plus years ago. That is a long time ago. Things have changed. Society's expectation has changed. People have become more cognizant of their rights and how they can legitimately go about making their points. So it's clear that a review of that legislation which was introduced in the most severe of times here in Canada and in Ontario—it was the beginning of the Second World War, that horrific wartime experience. The legislation was quickly enacted to provide some protection for critical facilities here in Ontario. Other jurisdictions in Canada did the same thing.

After the war ended in 1945, we had a period—1945 right up to the current—where we haven't had that sort of dramatic assault on our rights and freedoms as was caused by the Second World War. So the legislation sat there dormant, if you will. Fortunately, no one had to access it, because to the extent that we were having demonstrations and the like, they were forceful and clear, but they were peaceful.

The situation changed during the G20 because there were issues that Ontario was facing, but there were also global issues around the world that each of the G20 countries was dealing with. And over the number of years, whether it was in London a few years ago or Seattle a few years before that, a hardcore element of folks have organized themselves around these G20 summits and other kinds of summits to create not constructive criticism, not constructive demonstration, but chaos, to create anarchy.

This legislation, the new piece of legislation, was then brought in to ensure three things: to protect our infrastructure and protect the rights of people who want to demonstrate reasonably and so on; to deal with the anarchists, if you will, who were causing all the grief within these demonstrations; and, let's not forget, to protect the rights of those people who want to forcefully, vigorously, enthusiastically, colourfully and constructively demonstrate against a government policy, because they have that right to do that. Indeed, we're all the better for it, that we have these forceful debates out there. But the point is, we want to protect their rights to do it, we want to protect against the anarchists, if I can use that expression, and we want to protect our in-

stitutional assets. So the whole question is, how do you get that balance right so you achieve those three goods, if you will?

Well, we've had a lot of talk about the legislation, about why it was brought in. We've heard stories and concerns and so forth and so on. But I think it's important to take a look now at what the legislation actually says, what it does and what it does not do, because one of the reasons that we fell into the difficulty with this last piece of legislation is, it was brought forward, and I think it's fair to say that nobody really sort of sat down at the table and got the act out and went through it in some detail to see exactly what it said, what it didn't say, what it required police to do, what it said police couldn't do, what it required of demonstrators, and so on.

1510

What does this act actually say? To the extent that we all, in this body, that the media knows and the public knows exactly what this act says, then we will know if it has struck the right balance between protection and ensuring lively debates and lively demonstrations.

This is generally what the act said. First, the act was initially designed to protect power plants and dams and bridges and other critical infrastructure from sabotage in the context of the Second World War. The powers, fortunately, at the time, from 1935 to 1945, did not have to be extensively used, but they were there to be used for court security. The PWPA legislation allowed peace officers to request identification and search a person, a vehicle or property on entering a premises. Power generating facilities: The PWPA legislation allowed security personnel to refuse entry or demand a person to leave the site or the approach to a site, to use reasonable force and so on.

The PWPA's application during the recent G20 event, as I've said, led to a lot of criticism from civil liberties groups and the media and the Ombudsman's report. The government reacted to that criticism and asked former Chief Justice Roy McMurtry to report on the scope of that old act, the PWPA, and its appropriateness in today's time.

Justice McMurtry was a very distinguished Ontario Attorney General, a distinguished leader in our community. He was a trial judge of the Superior Court of Ontario, then he joined the Court of Appeal, and then he became the Chief Justice of Ontario. He has, over the years, established a stellar record as a human rights activist. In fact, the Attorney General's office at 720 Bay Street is named after him, the Roy McMurtry building—and Ian Scott, who was an equally distinguished Liberal Attorney General also very concerned with human rights.

What did Justice McMurtry recommend? First, right off the top he recommended the repeal of the PWPA and that a new piece of legislation be brought in to fill in the gaps and so on. What did we do with his report? We've all had a chance to read his report. The government, after receiving his report, consulted with all the civil liberties groups, municipalities, and power generation stakeholders. It took advice from Justice McMurtry and it took

the Ombudsman's report into consideration when it drafted the legislation, and it came up with the piece of legislation. I'm going to highlight what that legislation actually says because we should know what's in it to the extent that it can never be used to control a situation as we had in the recent G20.

The old PWPA is repealed. The Police Services Act is amended to provide for court security in the following ways—because the anarchists were attacking court security: It requires any person entering or inside a courthouse to produce identification and provide information to assess their security risk. That's not unreasonable. It allows for a search without a warrant of any person, property or vehicle entering or attempting to enter premises where court proceedings are conducted; search, without a warrant and using reasonable force if necessary, of any person who is in custody where court proceedings are conducted or who is being transported to or from such premises, or any property in the custody or care of that person.

This is important: It does not compel a person attempting to enter a courthouse to a search, to produce identification or to provide information. They can walk away. So you can be asked for that information. If you want to get into a court facility, which is a secure facility, if you are provided to give some explanation about who you are and ID, then by all means come in. If you choose not to, then you can walk away, and that's the end of the day.

If they persist in entering the courthouse after refusing to provide information or submit to a search, the court security can do the following: It can refuse entry or demand that a person leave the premises; it can use reasonable force, if necessary, to exclude or remove a person if they won't leave and won't give any information, ID, about who they are.

If a person does try to enter—so they have three levels of warning:

“Give us some ID.”

“No.”

“Okay, leave.”

If they persist in trying to get in, you can force them to leave, ask them to leave. If they still persist and won't identify themselves and so on, then they can be arrested. Then there is a penalty schedule, fines and so on that are attached to that conduct.

The electricity generating facilities and nuclear facilities: The legislation applies to prescribed electricity and generation facilities and nuclear facilities. Those are certainly facilities that we do not want to expose to a mob taking over and doing damage.

The act designates security personnel at these facilities as peace officers with a specific set of powers. They can request any person who wishes to enter or is on the premises to produce ID and provide information about why they're there. That information is necessary so those peace officers or those security persons can identify whether the person presents a security risk. They provide the information and answer those questions. The decision

then will be, “You're not a security risk. Come on in,” or, “You are a security risk. You can't come in.”

The legislation allows for a search upon consent. Upon consent, they can search any person, property or vehicle entering those premises. If the person says, “I don't want you to search my vehicle,” or a woman says, “I don't want you to search my handbag,” that's fine; that's the end of the matter. But the quid pro quo is that you can't come into the facility. What could be more reasonable than that?

The new legislation does not in any way replicate the power in the old PWPA that gives guards the authority to exercise their power in the approaches to the public work or the facility. That was one of the issues at the G20: As the people were coming down the street—and they might have been blocks away—police officers were stopping them and saying, “That's as close as you can get.”

That idea of blocking off facilities blocks and blocks away, the approaches to the facility, was a real concern to Justice McMurtry and to civil liberties groups. It was a concern because it was vague and very hard to define. I suppose you could have the nuclear plant at Darlington here on the outskirts of Toronto in the east end of the GTA—under the old legislation, it said that the authorities could stop anybody from approaching Darlington. Well, does “approaching Darlington” mean coming in from 10 or 15 miles down the 401, or maybe coming down the Don Valley Parkway or going along the old Highway 2? It was a pretty vague sort of thing, and that led to a lot of problems. So the legislation has really, really tightened up on that.

Under the new legislation, as a result of the tightening up, guards can exercise specific powers only—and this is important—on the premises, and if the approach falls outside the premises of the facilities, any issues that arise on those approaches will be addressed in partnership with local police, traffic coordinators or the like. But we've defined when security officials can get into this thing of, “You can't come any closer.” “Can't come any closer” means you can't get into the premise. It doesn't mean that you can't be a few miles away or a few blocks away.

#### 1520

If other infrastructure is identified in the future that should be included in the act—we've very specifically set out that couple of institutions that I've just referred to, the electrical facilities and the nuclear facilities, so we don't have the sort of blanket thing that, for instance, you have under the old legislation where arguably the police could say, “Well, the university or the hospital is a public facility that needs protection,” and the old law would apply to the hospital or the university setting.

In future, if somebody wants to include a site, it can be included in the act, but it's going to require a legislative amendment, which means it comes back here and we, as legislators, all get a chance to look at it and say, “Well, in addition to these rules that apply with respect to demonstrating at nuclear plants or electrical facilities, we are now including this institution.” We'll have a chance in this chamber to debate whether that should be heard.

That was one of Roy McMurtry's recommendations. That's what we also heard from the civil liberties group, and we are pleased to include that in the legislation.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Michael Harris:** I am pleased to take this opportunity to speak to Bill 34. I would like to begin by saying that I will be supporting this piece of legislation because it accepts both the findings of the Ontario Ombudsman and former Chief Justice Roy McMurtry.

It's clear that the illegal G20 law this government implemented using wartime measures contained in the Public Works Protection Act could have led to even more abuses than those that were witnessed on the streets of Toronto nearly two years ago. That's what I'd like to address first: Why was the law secret?

I'll remind the members present that this government invoked regulation 233/10 behind the closed doors of cabinet while this Legislature was sitting. There was no emergency, no imminent threat and, more importantly, no reason to bypass the duly elected representatives within this House, but that's exactly what this government did. It passed a secret law that greatly restricted civil liberties and then conspired to keep the details from the public. In fact, the Ombudsman called it a "pre-meditated, conscious ... decision not to announce the existence of the regulation."

This deliberate move to bypass the Legislature and public scrutiny created widespread confusion leading up to and during the G20 summit. People simply didn't know where the special powers of arrest were in effect. It wasn't until the G20 summit had ended that this government publicly acknowledged that the police did not have special powers to detain protestors within the area designated a public work under the regulation.

So I have to ask: If the police never did have any of these powers, why not be honest and tell Ontarians that it was so in the first place? I think it's clear from the Ombudsperson's findings that this government deliberately hid the details of this regulation from the public.

Ontarians want to believe their political representatives will be open, transparent and clear with them about matters that directly affect their rights. They don't want to read a scathing report from the Ombudsman that the government has greatly infringed on those rights and then conspired to keep it hidden. Because this bill will prevent a similar episode from happening in the future, I will be supporting it in second reading.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Taras Natyshak:** I'm pleased to respond to the comments by the member from Willowdale. I wish he was in his seat to hear what I was about to say. Here he comes.

The member raises some really integral points as to the necessity of the reforms of this bill, or the elimination of this bill, actually. I did catch a couple of references that the requirement of this bill—the previous Public Works Protection Act was enacted to provide security for

those wishing to exercise their rights, and I think that's misguided because in fact that act, again, strictly lays out that it is for the enforcement or protection of facilities, not of persons. It explicitly does not provide mechanisms for protection for any persons. So again, why was it enacted? Why was it brought about under this guise of security and providing security and safety to residents? Big questions that need to be answered.

We are happy to see it go. We do question the extension of some of these rights to security officers within our court system. We do question whether it will prohibit the public from actually playing a part in terms of the oversight and observation of how our court system works. We think that's an important aspect, that the public should be able to access court proceedings and judge those who are contributing and actually making our system work—again, in regard to our provincial courts.

But all told, Mr. Speaker, I think we look forward to debating this within committee and finding a good, comprehensive solution to the problem at hand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** I'm pleased to add a few comments following the very thoughtful review and comments by the member from Willowdale. This is a necessary legislative enactment that updates some very important protections—protections for institutions that we all hold as central to our democracy, namely, our courts; and the power facilities that we all rely on every single day, but that need the appropriate degree of protections because of their nature, because of their importance to our everyday life. We want to make sure that not only our nuclear facilities but our power generating facilities generally have the appropriate degree of protection so that we can continue to rely upon them. They are part of our foundation, part of the foundation of our lives and economy.

This bill captures not only the need but the appropriate degree of protection that they can have. This legislation came out of a very thoughtful and thorough review by former Chief Justice McMurtry—very helpful—to take a 70-year-old piece of legislation, which really had been around, some would say, beyond its appropriate term, update it, taking the best out of it, and making sure that it's fit for the time, not just today but in the future.

The legislative approach is a thoughtful one, and I thought the comments of my colleague from Willowdale really hit the nail on the head. It is the appropriate degree of protection for our facilities, our courts, and respecting civil liberties, the rights of all of us to be able to function and work, live and play in our society, knowing that our democratic institutions in the courts are protected and knowing that our essential power facilities and our rights are protected at the same time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** I'm pleased to respond to comments made by the member from Willowdale. We went through the André Marin report with the Ombudsman,

Caught in the Act, and we listened to Justice McMurtry's report.

I thank the minister for bringing the bill forward. Obviously, it's something that we have to have resolved for future events that happen in our province as well as protecting the power plants and the courts.

We can finger-point forever. I did want to say, thought that I thought—I was a critic for Community Safety and Correctional Services at the time and had an opportunity, prior to the G20, to talk to a lot of the police officers. If you'll recall, two or three weeks before the actual event, there were a number of police officers stationed around the Parliament buildings here. I remember one day that I talked to a lot of the police officers that were here, basically in riot gear and prepared to go out, but it was a really, really hot day. I'm sure if you're a police officer, the last place you want to be is in Toronto on a hot summer day in the middle of the summer when you could be home with your family and having a barbecue and this sort of thing.

1530

I applaud the police for the job they did. Not everyone knew about the rules and laws and all that sort of thing, and we've talked about that 100 times over. I talked to a number of people from police services from across the province, including the Barrie police service; the OPP had folks here, and, of course, the Toronto police service had a lot of people here. I just want to say that, overall, I thought they did a pretty spectacular job. It got out of control, there's no question, but in the end, you know what? We learn lessons from these kinds of events that cause us so much trouble.

Thank you very much.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much. That concludes the time for questions and comments.

I will return to the member for Willowdale if he wishes to reply.

**Mr. David Zimmer:** Just in conclusion, the old act was vague, it was overly comprehensive, it lacked definition, and, really, nobody knew what should be protected, how it should be protected and who it could be protected from.

The new act is limited, it's very precise, it's very defined, and it speaks to protecting two facilities: the court system—the courts—and the electricity-producing stations. So that's where the new act applies.

Then the act goes on, and it's very clear in how the protections develop. It gives the police, if you will, the authority to do a couple of things. First, if someone comes to a facility, there's a process of asking them to identify themselves and finding out why they're there—*not* unreasonable. The second step is, the person can comply with the request or not. If they don't comply with the request, they're not given entry. If they continue to persist to enter the facility, then, and only then, can the action be taken to arrest them and charge them and so on. That's a very graduated response, unlike what happened here in the past summer.

And the third thing: The bill makes it very clear that we're talking about the court facility, right at the facility, not in the blocks and blocks surrounding it or the approaches; the electricity-generating facility is at the facility, not the blocks and blocks and the miles leading to it, which caused the problem in the past summer.

Most importantly of all—or one of the most important things—is that if there's going to be any inclusions into those two sites, the courthouses or the electrical facilities, that request has to come back and be dealt with by way of an amendment by this Legislature so we all get to debate the inclusion.

Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much. Further debate?

**Mr. Norm Miller:** It's my pleasure to have the opportunity this Monday afternoon to be debating Bill 34, which is An Act to repeal the Public Works Protection Act, amend the Police Services Act with respect to court security and enact the Security for Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012. It could have been named creatively, something like the "We screwed up last time; let's protect our backside" bill, but that's not the name of this particular bill, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to give a little bit of history as to how we got to the point of debating this bill.

As we know, it's come about because of what happened when the G20 was hosted here in Toronto in 2010. The McGuinty government, in its wisdom, decided to pass on powers which they didn't communicate well. They actually passed, through order in council, on—I believe they had a cabinet meeting, a secret meeting, and passed a secret law in early June. Then they posted it to the e-Laws website June 16, just days before the G20, which was June 21 to 28. Actually, the printed edition of the new rules came out in the Ontario Gazette on July 3, after the fact. So they had a secret meeting to make these order-in-council changes to the Public Works Protection Act, and then didn't promote what they were trying to achieve. So the result was a lot of confusion, really.

You look at the reports from the time—the National Post, Wednesday, June 30, right at the time. The article states: "The province insists that no one was arrested or detained under the act, but criminal lawyer Howard Morton says such an assertion is incorrect. He says his client, 31-year-old Dave Vasey, has been charged under the act after being arrested last Thursday while walking near the outside of the security perimeter" at York Street and Bremner Boulevard. That's because this secret law made the perimeter of the area where the G20 was going to be held into this protected zone, and there was some confusion as to whether it applied to five metres within the fence that was put up in downtown Toronto or whether it was just the area within the fence. The police seemed to think that it was within five metres of the fence, and it was not promoted at all. The changes were passed by the McGuinty cabinet in secret, they just put it on the e-Laws website and it didn't actually get printed until the G20 actually happened.

The article goes on to say, "How can they not know my client was charged under the act? Do they not even know that?" Morton said, noting that he finds it a mystery as to why the Liberal cabinet extended the act behind closed doors if they wanted people to abide by the new measures. 'This is why they kept it secret: so they could posture it as applying outside (the security perimeter)'—don't you want people to obey a penal statute?

"A conviction under the act could result in a \$500 fine or two months in jail."

So there was certainly a lot of confusion at the time. It was pointed out also that this was not debated in the Legislature at the time. It was done very much in secret and was not published. You look at some of the reaction in the *Toronto Star* on June 25, and from people who were just trying to be about in downtown Toronto: "It's just unbelievable that you would have this kind of abuse of power where the cabinet can create this offence without having it debated in the Legislature," said Howard Morton, the lawyer representing Dave Vasey, who was arrested Thursday under the ... police powers.

"It was just done surreptitiously, like a mushroom growing under a rock at night."

Another lawyer said, "It reminds me a little bit of the War Measures Act", said lawyer Nathalie Des Rosiers of the new regulation. Des Rosiers is a lawyer with the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, which has been working to monitor arrests during the summit. 'This is highly unusual to have this declaration done by order in council without many people knowing about it.'

They go on to quote Mr. Morton: "They don't even have signs up saying you can't be within five metres or you're subject to the following," Morton said. 'If they really wanted to keep the peace, they would have announced the regulation.'

So, you know, if you have laws and then you don't tell anybody, you pass them the week before the G20 and then you don't tell people about it, how can you expect people to actually know about it? This Public Works Protection Act, 1990, actually came from a 1939 bill that was enacted to do with World War II for protection of Ontario at that time.

From the actual act happening and the G20, then we had a lot of public concern, of course, about it. The Ombudsman looked at it. His report was called *Caught in the Act*. In his summary he states that regulation 233/10, the regulation passed in secret by the McGuinty government "to enhance security during the G20 summit, should never have been enacted. It was likely unconstitutional. The effect of Regulation 233/10, now expired, was to infringe on freedom of expression in ways that do not seem justifiable in a free and democratic society. Specifically, the passage of the regulation triggered the extravagant police authority found in the Public Works Protection Act, including the power to arbitrarily arrest and detain people and to engage in unreasonable searches and seizures."

He goes on to say, "Even had regulation 233/10 been valid, the government should have handled its passage

better. Regulation 233/10 changed the rules of the game. It gave police powers that are unfamiliar in a free and democratic society. Steps should have been taken to ensure that the Toronto Police Service understood what they were getting. More importantly, the passage of the regulation should have been aggressively publicized, not disclosed only through obscure official information channels."

1540

He goes on to say, "All of this makes for a sorry legacy. The value in hosting international summits is that it permits the host nation to primp and pose before the eyes of the world. Ordinarily, Ontario and Canada could proudly showcase the majesty of a free and democratic society. The legacy of the passage and administration of regulation 233/10 is that we failed to do that well."

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, this demonstrates very much a poor judgment on the part of the McGuinty government to do with how to handle security, so we had the Ombudsman make a number of recommendations.

We've seen lots of other examples of bad judgment on the part of the McGuinty government, whether it's their spending that has got us into this \$30-billion hole that we now see Mr. Drummond predicting, or the FIT program, which has driven up energy prices, or, most recently, now we have, of course, the Ornge helicopter affair that seems to be dominating question period on a daily basis—more examples of bad judgment on the part of the McGuinty government, as were the rules passed before the G20 another example of bad judgment.

And then, I believe, at the same time as the Ombudsman's report, there was also another report, done by the Honourable Roy McMurtry, past Chief Justice, looking into the whole situation. His terms of reference were that he look at the definition of a public work; the scope of authority conferred to a law enforcement official for the purpose of protecting a public work; public notice requirements relating to the designation of a public work; and the application of the PWPA to significant public events, such as major national or international conferences and sporting events. He has made a number of recommendations from looking at this particular situation.

That's where we get to today, Mr. Speaker, where we have a bill before the Legislature that now would provide for the repeal of the Public Works Protection Act—that's the bill from 1939 and 1990—but bringing in some new powers to protect public works and to protect courts as well. So that's where we are today.

I think we would all agree that, certainly, the court system requires protection to keep all the people involved in the justice system safe. I think that's rational. I would say that in terms of other public works, like our nuclear generating stations, particularly, or other generating stations—certainly, in the world we live in today, where we have terrorists, obviously a nuclear generating station is something that could be a target and could cause grave damage if it is not protected. In many cases, nuclear generating stations are close to population areas, so I

think we'd all agree that it makes sense to protect those areas.

Whether we've got everything perfect in this bill—I'm not sure about that. I think we need to look at it in great detail. I heard the member, the other Mr. Miller, the member from Hamilton East–Stoney Creek, doing a comment earlier in the day, talking about the NDP having some concerns with schedule 2 of the bill. Schedule 2 amends the Police Services Act and creates a new subsection, 138(1), that “sets out powers that may be exercised by a person who is authorized by a municipal police services board or by the commissioner to act in relation to court security under part X of the act.”

It goes through very specifically in the bill outlining what those powers are:

“(a) requiring a person who is entering or attempting to enter premises where court proceedings are conducted...;

“(b) searching a person who is entering or attempting to enter premises where court proceedings are conducted...;

“(c) searching, using reasonable force if necessary, a person in custody who is on premises where court proceedings are conducted...;

“(d) refusing to allow a person to enter premises where court proceedings are conducted, and using reasonable force if necessary to prevent the person's entry; and

“(e) demanding that a person immediately leave premises where court proceedings are conducted, and using reasonable force if necessary....”

That's schedule 2 of the bill. I didn't read the whole thing, just the highlights.

I note that the third party has some questions about that, or at least the member from Hamilton East–Stoney Creek.

I would say that with this bill, as with most bills, it would be a good thing that it go to committee. It would be a good thing that those who are more intimately involved in the justice system—perhaps the police and others who are concerned about civil liberties—would be given the opportunity to go to the committee and work more carefully and exactly at what has been set out in the bill to make sure the government has indeed got it right. If they haven't got it right, then I would hope the government would be open to amendments to make sure that it is not another mess-up, as we've seen with some other legislation and some of the other ideas that the government has brought forward. I would certainly hope that this is going to go to committee, so that we'll be able to get a chance to look at it in more depth.

I heard the Minister of Community and Social Services speak in a two-minute hit a little earlier in the day, and he seemed to be shifting all the blame to the federal government, saying that the mess that happened at the G20 was all their fault. But I would simply ask: Who passed the secret act? It certainly wasn't the federal government; it was the McGuinty government that met in secret, passed the changes, didn't publicize it and then

created the confusion that certainly added to all the problems of the G20. That seems to me not to be a good shift of responsibility.

Earlier in the day, we heard the member from Hamilton East talk about what could have been done better at the G20. He, and the member from Willowdale who also spoke, talked about it being a relatively small group that were really the hardcore troublemakers. Unlike the member from Willowdale, I was up in my riding at the time, so I wasn't on-site. But certainly from watching the media coverage of the event, that's what it appeared: that there were these people who were intent on just creating bedlam and doing things like burning police cars etc., and they were covered up.

The question I asked myself was: Why would they be covering their identity unless they were planning on doing something illegal or creating problems? So it seems to me the police could have targeted those who were covering their identity. It might have been a good way of trying to deal with the problems as they were arising.

We also heard from the member from Simcoe North, who is a great supporter of the police and always has been. He said he felt that, given the challenging circumstances the police found themselves in—summertime, a hot summer day, big crowds, some pretty terrible things going on—he thought they did a pretty good job.

There's no doubt that this old law needs to change. It has been recommended in the Ombudsman's report, in the Report of the Review of the Public Works Protection Act from Mr. McMurtry that was submitted in April 2011, and that's really where this bill comes from, which would repeal the Public Works Protection Act and take another stab at providing security for our courts, electricity generating stations and nuclear facilities but not infringe on civil liberties.

On the surface, I certainly support the bill. But I do listen to the questions that have been raised by the third party and would simply say that I do believe that some of their concerns may be valid, so we need to take a look at them and weigh them all carefully through the processes of the committee so that the legislation is the best it can be.

1550

Too often we've seen in the past eight years where the McGuinty government, for whatever reason, either goes through the motions or just doesn't—often they'll have decided what they want to do ahead of time and it's usually more about spin than anything else and what the public thinks about a bill, and doesn't necessarily listen to what the public says.

I know I had the experience of sitting in on the changes to the Dog Owners' Liability Act—the pit bull ban bill—without knowing a lot about pit bulls at the time. We travelled around the province and listened to hundreds and hundreds of experts who do: veterinarians, people with the OSPCA, dog owners, experts in dog training who came before that committee, and we heard from all of them. I learned a lot about pit bulls: (a) that

they're not a breed, and that one of the breeds that the McGuinty government, in its wisdom, decided to consider a pit bull, the Staffordshire bull terrier, was actually the nanny dog in England; a very small dog of which there are thousands and thousands and they're very highly thought of.

My point is that the McGuinty government went through the motions of having committee, travelled all around the province, heard from hundreds of experts but didn't listen to them at all, because it had decided ahead of time that it was about the optics of looking like it was dealing with these vicious dogs, pit bulls. Now we have a private member's bill in the Legislature, sponsored by all three parties, to repeal that bill. I hope that doesn't happen this time, and that they listen to the experts about any concerns there might be with the fine print in this bill.

Certainly the outdated Public Works Protection Act included wartime powers for the protection of public works but relied too much on the discretion of the minister, and that's something that I believe is changed in the new legislation.

The former Minister of Public Safety and Correctional Services in the McGuinty cabinet used that discretion to secretly introduce special powers for police and foster the widespread confusion that followed by abdicating any responsibility to clarify what the law said.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have had a chance to speak to the bill today, and I look forward to comments and further debate on this, this afternoon.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** Mr. Speaker, when debating the proposed bill, it's important to stress this point—I want to stress it again—that, while I applaud the government for correcting a mistake, the mistake was one that this government wilfully made. This government utilized the Public Works Protection Act to create circumstances which resulted in the worst civil rights violations in the history of Ontario, the largest mass arrests of people in Ontario and a complete violation of our civil rights and liberties.

This was, again, no simple accident; this was not a mistake. This was a choice made by this government to enact special laws, secret laws that gave the police far too much power. This power was abused, and the fault lies clearly at the feet of this government.

There has been much talk about who is to blame and finger pointing. It's this government that enacted this law, it's this government that should be responsible and it's this government that should apologize for violating the thousands of people who were kept in temporary holding cells for three days and released with no charges whatsoever. Some 90% of the thousand people that were arrested were released with no charges. In fact, to date there have been only 24 convictions out of those 1,100 arrests—simply unacceptable.

Now, the new proposal, which is similar in schedules 2 and 3, has a dangerous clause—I stress this; it's very

dangerous. They require those who are attempting to attend our public courthouses to provide information to assess their security risk.

This is unacceptable. Courtrooms are public places. We should encourage the public, not create another obstacle, or another burden, for them to pass through to be able to access a public institution.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jim McDonnell:** It was with great zeal that I listened to the member from Parry Sound-Muskoka as he talked about some of the issues that revolve around the horrific event that happened in Toronto, something we should have been able to sit back and be proud of, that, in turn, because of the secretive rules—from the information that I've heard today and what I've read from the different reports, the crux of the problem is the secrecy around it. People did not know what laws they had to abide by.

It's a scary thought that a country that's very proud of being a leader in democracy does not have these rules clearer. It leads to problems. It leads to the ability of police to come up—and I'm sure from what I've read—to the crowds. If people knew there was a five-metre perimeter, they probably would have respected it. We have people living downtown, just going about their ordinary business, coming into conflict with police. It should never have happened, and it wouldn't have happened if they'd known what the rules were. To find out afterwards that the rules are first published a week after or a couple of weeks after the event is held is not something that I think we want to tell the public and something we're very proud of. And then to see the reaction, blaming the federal government, as they are responsible—but it's clear that, in this case, the Toronto police were very much aware of it. I question just how much they knew about the rules that they were given in this case, as they seemed to change partway through.

So let's learn from this lesson. As a party, we're supporting this bill, but we're looking forward that, in the end, it makes a difference and it doesn't happen again.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** I wanted to have a comment on this bill with respect to some of the debates that happened this afternoon. The member opposite from Stormont-Dundas-South Glengarry had mentioned that the mistakes that were made during the G20—the Liberal government, the provincial government, should have some role to play in those civil liberties that were violated at the time of the protest. Then the member opposite for the Ministry of Community and Social Services stood up and said, "No, the federal government is the one that was responsible for security," and basically was giving the impression that it's their fault or their mistake. I think the lesson that we have to learn is that both levels of government had a role to play in the civil liberties violations of these citizens. It's just not one or the other.

This government, under this bill, has basically said, in a way, that we're going to take responsibility for it because we want to fix the problem, and I'm glad to hear that. The problem needs to certainly be addressed. Protesters who want to have a peaceful demonstration should not be afraid that they're going to be arrested and detained for expressing their opinions opposite to what is going on in the city.

When I watched that on TV, after the news-breaking stories, I was really embarrassed. I was embarrassed and ashamed that I actually live in a country that allows regular citizens who went there peacefully to be treated that way, and I hope that this bill will make a difference so that this won't happen ever again.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** I just wanted to comment on a few of the words spoken by my colleague from Bramalea–Gore–Malton. The whole issue about the openness of the courts—we absolutely need our courts to be open. We absolutely need our public institutions to be available to the public. We need the public to be able to come in and watch, monitor, observe and help uphold the standards of justice that we hold so dear. We have a very strong system of justice, and as part of that free and open judicial system, we make sure that all those who are coming to observe and coming to participate have the requisite degree of protection. We make sure that the proceedings are themselves protected. Of course, for those in security, there are extensive protections. For the members of the public who want to come and observe, they have the right to be protected as well, as do the participants, some of whom are popular, some of whom are not.

1600

That's why, in virtually every court now, or fast extending to all courts, there are security measures at the perimeter to make sure that those who come in are not bringing in items of contraband, such as weapons, they should not; and for those who are not subject to the searches—the lawyers, the judges and the others—there is the appropriate identification that they produce. That's already in place right now.

So what we're really accomplishing through this particular piece of legislation is just to make sure that in our courts, our foundational institution for a democracy, we can have fair, open proceedings to the greatest extent possible. The way to guarantee those is to make sure that they can be conducted in a fair and open manner and that all those who are coming to watch are coming to watch, and nothing else.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** That concludes the time for questions and comments. I return to the member for Parry Sound–Muskoka to respond.

**Mr. Norm Miller:** Thank you, Speaker, and thank you to the members who commented: the member from Bramalea–Gore–Malton, who pointed out that the order in council passed by the government was a mistake—in his words, “mistakes wilfully made”—and there were

some significant civil rights violations in Ontario. A time that should have been a good time for us was not, necessarily.

I also appreciate the comments from the member from Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry, who talked about the confusion about the five-metre perimeter around the fenced zone in downtown Toronto; and the member from London–Fanshawe and the Minister of Energy, who did talk about the need for court security. I would certainly agree. I think all those people who go to courts expect them to be secure. Especially in light of the sorts of things going on at a court, checking for weapons is the rational thing to do. I personally don't have a problem with ID being checked to enter a courtroom as well, because I think it is important that our courts be secure.

On the broader question of G20s being held and where they should be held and the security costs, which are outside the parameters of this bill, I certainly wonder whether downtown in a big city is really the best location for something like a G20, especially with the huge security costs we're talking about nowadays. It seems to me that maybe they should be holding them on a military base, where there's already security built in, saving significant money in terms of the cost of providing the security required.

Anyway, thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak this afternoon.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Further debate?

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** It's a pleasure and a privilege to be able to speak today about the repeal of the Public Works Protection Act, the proposed amendments to the Police Services Act in relation to court security and the new Security for Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act.

I think it's important to touch on some of the issues that came about during the application of the Public Works Protection Act which have led to this debate about its repeal. It's also important to discuss what happened in 2010, because these amendments are meant to ensure that it never happens again and that this government has learned its lesson.

This bill is a direct result of the issues that many citizens' groups have raised in response to the government of Ontario during the G20 events in 2010. More than 1,100 arrests were made—the largest mass arrest in Canadian history. There was widespread denial of democratic rights and freedoms. A secret law was enacted, and there were—and let's be generous—less-than-transparent decision-making processes between government and law enforcement.

As a result, six separate reviews took place around G20 security, yet none had the mandate or the jurisdiction to ask the most fundamental questions or provide Ontarians with the answers that they were asking. Andrea Horwath introduced a private member's bill, the G20 Public Inquiry Act. This bill would have established an independent commission that would have carried out a full public review.

Despite all the other reviews that took place, a public inquiry is the missing and essential piece of the G20 puzzle. The public inquiry would have reported on the decisions and actions of the McGuinty government and law enforcement during the G20. It would have provided a fuller accounting of taxpayer dollars. However, this bill did not pass. This bill, which would have given us that inquiry, did not pass, and Ontarians never got the answers that were owed to them from this failed security policy during the G20. It comes as no surprise to any of us, then, when I say that there were serious issues with security during the G20. Civil liberties were trampled. We all saw it on TV, many of us in person, while it happened. The Canadian Civil Liberties Association had this to say about government actions during the G20:

"The conditions for some of the policing problems that were experienced during the summit were set during the preparatory stage.... For example, the lack of transparency surrounding the designation of the security perimeter as a 'public work' led to misunderstandings as to the scope of search and seizure powers and, in our view, to an inappropriate use of these powers. The large number of police officers during the week leading to the G20 generated both a suspicion of wasted resources and a sentiment of potential intimidation. June 26 represents a turning point. Widespread property damage was committed by a cohort of vandals in the downtown of Toronto on that day. We condemn this criminal activity and acknowledge that it warranted a response by police. The response which police provided, however, was unprecedented, disproportionate and, at times, unconstitutional."

From the many reports it emerged that government had enacted regulations that increased the powers of police, except that nobody knew about that until people started getting arrested. The Canadian Civil Liberties Association asked for an apology from the government of Ontario on the way it handled G20 security, but that was never received.

As reports surfaced with their recommendations, it became clear there was considerable reason for concern in the way that the government had handled the period before the G20 and the events themselves. Stories circulated throughout the G20 weekend of citizens being stopped and searched at various locations in the downtown core only because they were wearing an item of black clothing. A number of people also reported that the police cited the Public Works Protection Act as authority to conduct searches and require identification, despite the fact they were nowhere near the security fence. Most importantly, regulation 233/10, passed to enhance security during the G20 summit, was viewed by many as an issue itself. Ombudsman André Marin stated that:

"Regulation 233/10, passed to enhance security during the G20 summit, should never have been enacted. It was likely unconstitutional. The effect of regulation 233/10, now expired, was to infringe on freedom of expression in ways that do not seem justifiable in a free and democratic society. Specifically, the passage of the regulation

triggered the extravagant police authority found in the Public Works Protection Act, including the power to arbitrarily arrest and detain people and to engage in unreasonable searches and seizures. Even apart from the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the legality of regulation 233/10 is doubtful. The Public Works Protection Act under which it was proclaimed authorizes regulations to be created to protect infrastructure, not to provide security to people during events. Regulation 233/10 was therefore probably invalid for having exceeded the authority of the enactment under which it was passed. These problems should have been apparent, and given the tremendous power regulation 233/10 conferred on the police, sober and considered reflection should have been given to whether it was appropriate to arm officers with such authority. This was not done. The decision of the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services to sponsor...."

1610

Speaker, it is very clear from the observations of the Canadian Civil Liberties Association and the Ombudsman that the powers that were used at the G20 against the public, against people from all over Ontario, exceeded what we would consider to be normal democratic and constitutional powers. In fact, it said that they were used in an unconstitutional way.

What we saw, Speaker, was an abuse of power that was aided and abetted by this government and that, as my colleague from Brampton has said, was done consciously, not accidentally. A law was passed; it was not announced. It was acted upon. People were arrested and jailed. And only after the events were over was there any public statement about what was really going on. Speaker, that's not the way things should be operating in this country and in this province.

Having said all that, let us assume just for a second that regulation 233/10 was indeed appropriate for the circumstances involved. Since the regulation significantly changes the rules of the game, it would only be appropriate that the government would have done whatever was in its power to publicize the fact that the rules had changed. Speaker, you can go around this city and you can go around cities and towns all over Ontario where signs are posted informing people of laws that are relevant to their activity with regard to traffic. When laws change around drunk driving, there are advertising campaigns. When laws change protecting consumers, the public is informed. When the laws change in a fundamental way that affects people's rights, their liberties, their ability to express themselves, their ability to move freely on the streets and assemble—rights that were fought for in wars, rights that people died for—and then are just casually thrown away by a government that takes advantage of some dusty rules on the books that should have been withdrawn decades ago, what you have is irresponsibility. What you have is an ignoring of our democratic rights and our democratic traditions.

Why didn't the government notify citizens and groups involved in the protests of the extra requirements? Had

people being properly notified, groups would have known their rights and what was required of them; their actions could have been different, and many of the police confrontations would not have occurred. The government failed in providing not enough public information. In fact, I might argue that the government failed to provide any real information. Of the notices that were placed in newspapers about the G20 and about steps being taken to provide security, none of them mentioned the Public Works Protection Act. What was the great secret? What had to be withheld from the public? What had to be kept from the heart of the public such that no enemies of the state could be made aware of these deep, dark secrets? Speaker, what was kept from the public was a law passed in secret, exercised against the public with no prior notice and against the interests of our democracy.

Full notification of citizens and groups involved in protests was not pursued by the ministry. Even worse, the police themselves were not fully briefed on the extended powers that they really possessed. Minister Meilleur herself said recently that it was a problem of communication. While communication was definitely one of the things that went severely wrong with the way the government handled the G20 security, it certainly was not the only issue.

David Vasey, a York University environmental science master student, had probably never heard of the Public Works Protection Act before June 24, 2010. I can tell you myself, Speaker, I hadn't heard of it. Curious about the fence, which isn't a normal sight in downtown Toronto, Mr. Vasey stepped too close to it to see what was on the inside. This was enough to make police officers suspicious and, armed with rights that nobody knew about, they stopped Mr. Vasey and asked for identification. Without knowing about the passing of regulation 233/10, Mr. Vasey refused to provide identification. He would have been within his rights had the circumstances been different.

I was down at the security fence the Thursday before that weekend. There was no information saying, "This fence is a public works. Do not approach, don't come close, don't ask questions. Be prepared to identify yourself"—none of that. But the situation was now changed and Mr. Vasey found himself under arrest by authority of the Public Works Protection Act.

At least one other person was detained and charged under the act in connection with G20 summit security.

Like many of those stopped, Mr. Vasey was involved in peaceful protest, but the arrests were not just confined to protestors. They included people who were just walking by or who had legitimate business close to the secure perimeter. The examples are many: like Rob Kittredge, a lawyer who worked just outside of the security perimeter and whose photographs were confiscated and who was banned from coming close to the security zone under this same act.

Nobody knew about the regulation until after Mr. Vasey was arrested—well, really, Speaker, after the protests had started. A number of complainants approached

the Office of the Ombudsman afterwards, after over 1,000 people were arrested. These complainants gave first-hand accounts of the experience with police officers during the G20 weekend.

A 57-year-old from Thorold, Ontario, who was also an amputee, came down to participate on the labour march and rally. Now, my colleague the member of provincial Parliament from Welland will speak to this case in far greater detail when it's her turn to speak later today. That said, this story is horrendous. The story is indefensible. The story is an inevitable outcome of secret laws, of the provision of authority unexplained to police. That story which you will hear is an example of how badly things can go wrong when laws are written improperly and governments act in secret.

Speaker, the process used by the Ontario government to pass regulation 233/10 under the Public Works Protection Act, including the absence of public debate, transparency and consultation, was a major problem that led to many violations during the G20.

Speaker, you were here in the last Parliament. I assume, Speaker, that you were never consulted. Reach into your memory. At any point was there a statement by a minister in this House saying, "Members of provincial Parliament, those who represent the people of Ontario, in the coming month, in the coming week, we will pass a regulation that will allow the police to arrest anyone who comes within the perimeter of this fence we're putting up"? Mr. Speaker, you have no memory of that because that did not happen. You and the other members of this House who were elected prior to the last election were not consulted as lawmakers. I can well imagine that you, your party, our party and many of the backbenchers of the government party would have spoken up and said, "Are you crazy? You're actually proposing to do this? Do you understand what you're unleashing?" But we didn't get an opportunity to speak. We're only lawmakers. We're only legislators. We don't need to be consulted on these matters, Speaker. It's best left in the hands of the cabinet, in quiet, in secrecy, with information passed on to the public only as they're arrested and carted off.

1620

Speaker, citizens were stripped of rights they possessed, and police officers believed they had powers they did not actually have. The Ministry of Community Safety was left to try and mitigate the vacuum. We've all seen what happened then.

Now, how is the government proposing to prevent this from happening again? The proposed bill before us today contains three schedules that I will discuss in order. One, it would repeal the Public Works Protection Act, an act that was enacted in 1939, which gave police wartime powers. It should never have been used to deal with security during the G20 summit in 2010. It was an act that was taken under extreme emergency measures and, quite frankly, belongs in 1939, not 2010 in downtown Toronto, in downtown Welland, in downtown Brampton or London, or anywhere in this province.

Security or peace officers were given the kind of power and authority that would be expected during an

emergency circumstance, which certainly stretches to the point of transgression of constitutional rights for citizens. The G20 did not warrant that kind of response.

It's only normal that during an event of such importance as the G20, security concerns might go against civil liberties, but the task of the government and the police involved in providing security is finding a balance between those liberties that so many have fought for and that security that's needed at a given point. We didn't have that balance during that event, Speaker. What we had was catastrophically tilted against the public.

As the Ombudsman noted, regulation 233/10 worked to trip the powers of the Public Works Protection Act, thereby enabling the arrest and muting of protesters and others who had done nothing wrong. The impact of regulation 233/10 on freedom of expression was therefore almost certainly disproportionate. So we should all strive to ensure that there's no repeat of trampling of civil rights that happened during the G20.

Security during the G20 could have been handled under different legislation. The Public Works Protection Act only dealt with structures, not people. Calling on this particular act to address the issues related to the security of foreign heads of state does not make any sense.

Just a simple quote from the PWPA is indicative of the scope and historically reality that the government was faced with in 1939. I believe, given my time, this may be the last thing I get to say:

"We meet today under circumstances of the utmost gravity. The possibility of war, in which we are now engaged, was fully realized and debated by you at the last session, when you passed unanimously a resolution calling, in such event, for the complete mobilization of all our resources.

"Legislation calculated to give effect to the determination then expressed will be immediately submitted to you. You will be asked to pass measures designed to increase agricultural and industrial production, and for the protection of our vital public works and services."

Speaker, that was quite appropriate during that war and that emergency. It is not appropriate now. It was not appropriate during the G20 weekend. Thank you, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** It's a pleasure to join the debate and to follow the remarks from the member of Toronto-Danforth, who I've come to believe is a very sincere member of this House, and I think he brings forward his opinions in a very logical and ordered way. Many of the things he said I agreed with.

I think if we take a look at some of the facts that led to today, we'll have to realize—I don't think there's any argument that a G20 summit was held in Toronto. Whether it should have been held in Toronto is, I think, open for debate. Nevertheless, it was held in Toronto, and it did attract people who are attracted to G20 summits. It attracted some reasonable, ordinary citizens who wanted to express their dissatisfaction with various

things that were happening around the world involving some of the leaders who were represented at the G20 summit. It also attracted some individuals who are attracted to these types of summits whose intent was one of violence and was one of exhibiting their protest in a way that is not accepted by our society. That obviously led to a police involvement in those situations. That's not been unusual in any jurisdiction that has been chosen to host a G20 summit in the past.

I think the facts that led to the event are ones that can't be argued with. What I think is the measure, though, is that when our method of dealing with that protest was, in the fullness of time, examined, it was found lacking; it was found wanting. What we have put before us today as a result of Chief Justice McMurtry's report are some things to improve that situation.

I think we could spend the next two weeks assigning blame. What I see this as is a way of moving forward. I think everybody shares, perhaps, some of the blame on this. It's important, though, that the House come together, I think, and move forward with legislation that is going to work better in the future.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jerry J. Ouellette:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the member from Toronto-Danforth's remarks regarding Bill 34, An Act to repeal the Public Works Protection Act, amend the Police Services Act with respect to court security and enact the Security for Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012.

There were many things that were talked about in the focus on the G20 and what took place there. As the member from Oakville mentioned, there was certainly an attraction of individuals who are not necessarily the ones that we would like to bring into our jurisdiction in the province of Ontario for events like this. You only had to look at the CBC or the media reports recently on what's taken place, and Chief Blair was questioning as to how it was handled. Certainly, the member from Toronto-Danforth mentioned the fact that they didn't have all the details about what their actual boundaries were and what took place.

Mr. Speaker, having come from a policing family—my mother's father, my grandfather, was a chief constable, and my father was the chief of police in Thunder Bay—you gain a different perspective from the policing community on what to expect or not to expect. There are some questions that this brings forward that are more concerning to me. What information did the government receive that gave them the belief that it was warranted to move forward with this? What is out there now that said, "We need to do this, and here are the reasons why"?

The government was obviously acting with some information that was leading them to believe it was in the best interests of the public at that time. I think that we, as members of this Legislature, would certainly like to know where that information is, how it was verified, and what was the intent of it.

Certainly, we saw the actions of individuals who we don't want to see operating in the province of Ontario, but more concerning are the implications of where the information came from and what led them to the belief that it was necessary to move forward with the act in the first place.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** I'd like to take this opportunity to speak on Bill 34, the Security for Courts, Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012. I'd like to thank the speakers before; they had really good points.

I wasn't a member of this House when this all happened. I was a farmer—still am—but I was watching on TV, and the first thought that came to my mind was, "This can't be my Ontario. How could this happen?"

Police have to do their job to protect people, but now I realize that in this, my Ontario, this House never even knew; it didn't really know what was approved or what wasn't, and that's even more concerning.

As others have said in this House, my parents also fled places where they thought their rights were being trampled on, and they came to a place where they were sure that that would never happen to them. And now I hear that there are occasions in this province where this has happened.

To me, one of the ways that you use police action is that people know what the consequences of doing something are, and the threat of those consequences is one of the things that deters people from doing things. But if you never tell them what the consequences are, you never develop a deterrent, so it snowballs into something much worse. That's what happened here, in my opinion.

There's lots of blame to go around. I agree we have to move on, and what is proposed here is better than what we had, but what we had obviously wasn't very good.

1630

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** We have time for one last question and comment.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I do appreciate the comments made by the member from Toronto—Danforth.

This is a very serious discussion—a serious discussion that this Legislature needs to have. But to put it somewhat in the historical context, of course, there were two measures that were brought in: in September 1939, the government of Canada invoked the War Measures Act and the province of Ontario brought in the Public Works Protection Act. Both acts at that particular time gave extraordinary powers to law enforcement agencies and brought in—basically there was a threat of sabotage prior to the United States entering the war in December 1941.

Subsequently, in October 1970 the government of Mr. Trudeau invoked the War Measures Act to deal with situations in the province of Quebec: the murder of Pierre Laporte and the kidnapping of James Cross.

After that rather tragic incident in Canadian history, there was a review and revision, substantially, of the War

Measures Act and a piece of replacement legislation brought in. Subsequently, after the proclamation of the Public Works Act, we're doing the same thing here in the province of Ontario.

The real issue that came out of that, of course, was the enforcement of this five-foot-rule issue. Was it five feet outside the perimeter or five feet inside the perimeter? Certainly, when you look at the Public Works Protection Act of 1939, the intent was sort of five feet within the security perimeter, giving police authority for someone who would have penetrated fencing around a public utility site, and indeed that was the gist of the act.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** That concludes the time we have for questions and comments.

I now return to the member for Toronto—Danforth, who has two minutes to reply.

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** Thank you, Speaker, and my thanks to the members from Oakville, Oshawa, Timiskaming—Cochrane and Peterborough for their commentary.

To the member from Oakville, you were quite correct in stating that there were people who came to that demonstration whose interest was far beyond simply protesting the policies of the G20. Certainly the response of many of my constituents was that it looked as though the police were not dealing with those people when they were attacking small businesses but were spending all their time down at the perimeter fence arresting people who were protesting against the G20. The priorities seemed very skewed to many constituents of mine that I talked to.

I think, Speaker—and others will enlarge on this as the debate continues—that in this bill, the protections for courthouses are ones that are going to have to be reconsidered by legislators. I think it's critical in a democracy that people be allowed to go into courts, sit in on trials and see that justice—to the extent that it can be served in an imperfect world—is served. It's something, again, that in our democratic tradition has been critical.

As a high school student, I remember reading about the Court of Star Chamber in Britain—medieval times—the closing off of court decisions from the public. Many regimes that we can think of that we've been critical of are ones that have closed courtrooms; people can't enter, can't witness what really goes on.

I'm worried, Speaker, and this House should be worried, about unreasonable restrictions on the access of the public to courts, because if we don't have open courts, we are going to have profound problems with the administration of justice.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Further debate?

**Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to have an opportunity to speak today to Bill 34. I just wanted to start with some comments.

The foundation of Bill 34 is the Report of the Review of the Public Works Protection Act, which was prepared by the Honourable Roy McMurtry. His report came out in April 2011. Our government asked for this report to be

prepared, and the Honourable Roy McMurtry was kind enough to prepare a very thorough 55-page report. I have read the report and I just want to read a little bit of the conclusion of this report, because it forms the basis of Bill 34. At the very end of the report, the Honourable Roy McMurtry states as follows:

"The PWPA"—otherwise known as the Public Works Protection Act—"was enacted in 1939 to support the war effort. At the time, the protection of Ontario's hydroelectric facilities from sabotage was of particular concern. Since then, the PWPA has been used to provide the legal foundation for the powers exercised by the police in providing court security and, even more recently, by the OPG"—Ontario Power Generation—"in securing nuclear power facilities. In June 2010 the PWPA was used to provide powers to secure intergovernmental conferences. The vagueness of the PWPA permits it to be used in situations when it is arguably not necessary and potentially abusive. In my view, the PWPA has been used for purposes beyond its original intent.

"The time for the PWPA seems to have passed. If the government of Ontario enacts, as I have suggested, specific legislation to provide for courthouse security and power generating infrastructure security, it would appear that there is no longer a need for the PWPA. I am also mindful of the existence of counter-terrorism and emergencies legislation to deal with these situations as they arise.

"In determining the boundaries of police powers, caution is required to ensure the proper balance between preventing excessive intrusions on an individual's liberty and privacy, and enabling the police to do what is reasonably necessary to perform their duties in protecting the public.' The overly broad and vague language of the PWPA does not strike this required balance with individual rights and freedoms.

"The late Justice Jackson, of the United States Supreme Court, stated that every emergency power, once conferred, 'lies about like a loaded weapon ready for the hand of any authority that can bring forward a plausible claim of an urgent need.' The need to protect the public must be balanced with the requirement to preserve fundamental rights and freedoms.

"Yet, at the same time, 'Canadians are entitled to demand the best public order policing possible from their government.' There is no question that we live in a different world post 9/11. We live in difficult times with constant threats both domestically and from abroad. The police clearly need to be given adequate powers to carry out their duties. The police use their expertise on a daily basis to assess the powers they require. In instances where they take action that exceeds their powers, their actions are examined by various mandated bodies. This process, I believe, results in the proper balance between police powers and individual rights and freedoms. Therefore, any legislation that purports to grant special police powers must be specific and direct and developed in consultation with stakeholders and tested through thorough debate in our transparent democratic system."

Mr. Speaker, we did what the Honourable Roy McMurtry asked us to do. We consulted with stakeholders and then we asked Mr. McMurtry to prepare a report. As a result of that report, we have in front of us today and are debating Bill 34. I'll just read what it does: An act to repeal the Public Works Protection Act, amend the Police Services Act with respect to court security and enact the Security for Electrical Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012. In other words, it does three things. First of all, the bill in front of us repeals the Public Works Protection Act. Secondly, it basically lays out proper court security. Thirdly, it provides for security for electricity generating facilities and nuclear facilities as well. I'll basically go through each one of those sections very quickly and just comment on some of these recommendations in front of us.

#### 1640

The Public Works Protection Act, which we've talked about in this chamber today, was enacted in 1939. It was enacted at that time because there was a concern about the protection of certain electrical facilities at the start of the war, World War II. Actually, the Ontario government asked for this legislation to be passed. The federal government said, "No, we're not going to do it," and passed it back to Ontario to pass this bill.

The bill was in place and was enacted to protect hydroelectric facilities against what they called "enemy saboteurs" during World War II. It still is used on a daily basis to provide security at electrical generating places and court facilities. So this bill is still being used, and the problem with the bill is that it is interpreted in a very broad sense.

We, in this new piece of legislation, are repealing that piece of legislation and replacing it with the new bill in front of us. The new bill will cover two specific areas. It will cover court security, and it will cover protection for electrical and nuclear facilities that we have in Ontario.

The second point that I wanted to make here today is that we're amending the Police Services Act. Security is enhanced for court security. The world has changed, as Mr. McMurtry pointed out. I remember, many years ago, back in the nearly 1980s, here in Toronto's Osgoode courthouse, someone entered the courtroom—I think there was a family law trial going on. There was no security at that time, back in 1982, which wasn't too long ago. At some point, when the verdict was read, a gentleman pulled out a gun, shot and killed two lawyers, paralyzed another lawyer and then ran out of the court. No one stopped him, and he made his way back to India. It took over 10 years to extradite this gentleman back to Canada and put him on trial. That's the way things were back then.

I remember as a lawyer, when I was practising law, entering a courthouse—and this was back in my days in Scarborough. It was one at Eglinton and Warden, a pretty large facility, and I would have to always show my lawyer's card in order to enter. Sometimes, even when I showed my lawyer's card, they still wanted me to go through a metal detector as well as a body search to make sure that nothing would happen there.

A few years ago—I don't remember the exact date—in a courthouse here in Ontario, someone was stabbed in the neck while trying to get into a courthouse. So there are needs nowadays to enhance security in courthouses.

The new subsection in front of us today amends the previous act that we had regarding court facilities and sets out the powers that may be exercised regarding court security. These requests that are in the act today are reasonable: The person coming in has to produce ID and information, if requested by the court official or the court security guard; a person can be searched who tries to enter a court; someone in custody can be searched; someone who enters a courthouse can be refused entry to that courthouse in various circumstances; and also, fifthly, court security can demand that a person leave the courtroom. There's also a new section created that sets out the offences for breaching or not following or carrying through on these five different items that I just mentioned.

I think it's important to have these court security services laid out clearly in the new act in front of us today.

Thirdly, the act in front of us provides for security for electricity generating facilities and nuclear facilities here in Ontario. Again, right now, there is no particular act in place—this will be a brand new act that we'll create—that security officials at these locations can rely upon. They were relying upon old legislation that had been enacted back in 1939 to justify protecting an electrical generating facility or a nuclear facility.

So the new legislation in front of us restricts access to a facility and it defines the reasons why the access to the facility would be denied to someone, or restricted; and it provides for persons to be appointed to provide security services, because right now, what these electrical or nuclear generating locations do is either hire security guards or rely upon other services, perhaps even the police, to guard their locations.

I remember one day I walked right by the Pickering nuclear plant one evening. There was no security outside. I got very close to the front door. I just went down there to check out the windmill that they had outside the Pickering nuclear facility. It almost seemed like I could walk in the front door. I think we wanted to find exactly what you can and cannot do when you enter, or someone tries to enter, a nuclear facility.

Also in this new bill regarding nuclear and electricity generating facilities, the appointees are peace officers. If my understanding of the law is correct, peace officers are usually police officers. They can be beyond police officers, but I always remember peace officers being described as police officers. So the appointees that could be placed in front of a nuclear plant or an electricity generating plant are basically laid out here as being peace officers.

Section 4 of the bill in front of us sets out the powers that may be exercised by appointees and other peace officers. Basically, it explains the new bill—something that's very important. It says what you can and cannot do as a peace officer when you're guarding one of these

facilities. You can ask, again, for someone who wants to enter the facility to produce ID, and that's clearly stated. If someone wants to come in, show your ID. Secondly, you can search a person who wants to enter—that's the second requirement; thirdly, refuse to allow a person to enter, so that power is also laid out; and fourthly, demand that a person immediately leave, and that's also laid out in part 4 of this bill.

Here's an important part of the new bill. Under subsection 7(1), it authorizes regulations. For those who don't know outside of here, who would be watching on television, regulations are produced by cabinet or the executive council and basically are add-ons to the law or to the bill in front of us. So if there's a situation that arises regarding security, executive council or cabinet can authorize regulations. It also sets out the offences that may be imposed on someone who tries to break one of these rules.

Fifthly, it provides power to arrest a person committing an offence. So everything is laid out clearly now in the new act.

Previously, as I mentioned, these facilities relied upon the Public Works Protection Act, or PWSA, which wasn't that specific. It basically set out how to make sure that electricity facilities back in 1939 were well protected and prevented saboteurs—whatever that means; “saboteurs” is a nice term to use—from entering these facilities, taking over these facilities or perhaps even destroying these facilities during time of war. So now the new act in front of us that's being recommended in Bill 34 sets out exactly what can and cannot be done.

I think it's important to recognize the most important thing—and this is why I support the bill. I think it's a good bill to put forward, and I'm glad the government and the minister have put this bill forward. We live in a different world. We don't live in 1939 any more. Times have changed now. We live in a completely different time period. For example, if you wanted to go into an airport many, many years ago, you just walked through the terminal, checked in your luggage and went and sat down inside the plane. I remember that when I was very young. My parents took me—actually, the whole family—on a trip. Security was extremely light, if not non-existent.

1650

Go to the airport now and it has completely changed. There's at least one metal detector. They have these new facilities at the airport where they actually blow air to find out if you're wearing a weapon inside of you, or perhaps even inside your body. It's very strange. It's like perhaps someone does an operation and puts some kind of weapon inside of you. That was unthinkable back in the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s, or even the 1960s.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, entering this Legislature myself as a student—I went to the University of Toronto. I just walked in. I don't remember any security at that time. I just walked in. I'm trying to find out when they brought security into this building. The best recollection I have is that after the protests began in 1995 and 1996

outside on the front lawn here, they began putting security guards at the entrances, and if you wanted to enter, you had to say who you were seeing and the reason why you were coming in here, and also keep a name badge on your jacket, your shirt, your sweater or whatever you were wearing at that time, and that exists today.

Back then, in the 1930s and 1940s, there weren't cameras around. People were able to do things without thinking, "There's a camera watching me. I had better think twice before I commit some act." Nowadays, people have to think twice, because there are more cameras around and there are more guards around and there are more measures in place to prevent someone from committing a crime, especially in an important place like an electricity generating facility or a nuclear facility here in Ontario.

The world has changed, as Mr. McMurtry points out. He says in his report that the old act, the Public Works Protection Act, has to be repealed and replaced with something new. We're following his recommendations. We listened to what he had to say, we listened to the stakeholders and we came forward with a bill that is not too broad and is very specific to what we have to do to protect our facilities nowadays.

The other point I want to make—we've heard this around the room today—is the importance of striking a balance. People have mentioned the fact that you don't want to restrict a person's freedoms, and I agree with that. I think this bill allows people to express their freedoms but also protects the public in general so that someone is still allowed to express their freedom, which is enshrined in our Constitution—the freedom to express oneself—but at the same time doesn't allow someone in the public to be endangered.

I honestly believe that what happened—everyone in the room here today has talked about the G20, and I'm not defending the police here and I'm not defending anyone else who was involved in riots. But there wasn't a defined regulation in place or defined rule in place to say what can be done and what can't be done. Whether or not the police overreacted, many people think so. I'm not saying they didn't, but on the other hand, they had a situation on hand that was unprecedented, unheard of, where they had to protect people here in Toronto, in downtown Toronto, and they tried their best, using the Public Works Protection Act and some other legislation to justify what they were doing but not having anything specific.

Cabinet can now, under the new legislation, sit down and create a regulation to ensure that if a particular incident takes place—for example, here in Toronto when the G20 was held—the rules are laid out clearly. It was a unique situation, and we are responding by putting forward a piece of legislation that makes very clear what we want to do.

To strike that balance is very difficult at times, Mr. Speaker. People want to express their rights. We've seen that in other incidents—Occupy Toronto or Occupy in

various cities in the United States—they have the right to express themselves. But on the other hand, the owners of the property—for example, I think it was the Anglican church in downtown Toronto—also had their concerns about the grass and the property there, and they have a right as well for their place to be protected.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I support the new bill in front of us. It's a very good bill that defines certain rules and regulations, and I think it's appropriate to pass it today.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mrs. Christine Elliott:** This is an important topic that we're discussing this afternoon. The protection of civil liberties, of course, is very important in our society, and we need to be vigilant that we don't restrict civil liberties, except where absolutely necessary.

As you've heard from the comments that have been made by my colleagues on the PC side of things, we are in support of the new bill, the Security for Courts, Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, but I think we need to take a look at the reason behind the bill, why it came into play. Of course, that's because of the mess that the McGuinty Liberals made with respect to certain police powers during the G20 summit in Toronto in 2010. That's the real heart of what we're talking about here.

As the member from Scarborough Southwest indicated, Bill 34, the new act, repeals the old Public Works Protection Act. As has been noted, this was a statute that was enacted in 1939 to secure against Nazi saboteurs early on in World War II. Clearly, this is not a statute that this government should have been operating under in 2010; it was intended for very specific purposes which have long passed by us.

In any event, that's what the McGuinty government used in order to bring about, as a result of an order in council that was never communicated until very late on in the game, to allow for special police powers during the period from June 21 through June 28, which was the time of the G20 summit. This is something that was not communicated to the members of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's important to note that. This was not an emergency under which these police powers were brought forward. We knew when the G20 summit was going to be happening. There was no need to not inform the members of this Legislature, or the members of the public, for that matter. So while we applaud the fact that this bill has come forward—we are going to support it—one has to wonder if this government has learned their lesson. Given what's going on with Ornge right now, I would say I doubt it very much.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** Building on some of the comments from my honourable colleague in the opposition, the concerns are exactly that. We're hoping that this government has learned from some of their mistakes, both with the Ornge scandal and with the G20 debacle.

In particular, if you look at some of the troubling portions of this bill, essentially we are giving some

unfettered and extraordinary powers to security personnel at courthouses. In particular, let's evaluate a bit more carefully one of the sections. There's a requirement to "provide information for the purpose of assessing whether the person poses a security risk." That is such a broad use of language that that could encompass anything. We're basically giving court security personnel, police personnel at a courthouse, which is supposed to be a public institution, a wide latitude to ask any sort of question whatsoever. They could ask about political affiliation; they could ask about minor criminal convictions in the past, about family members who have criminal convictions. This bill essentially allows an unfettered access to question and to obtain the information that if they don't provide an answer to, they could be sent out of the courthouse and possibly be arrested.

Furthermore, what's even more troubling is, it provides a right or the ability to "search, without warrant ... any vehicle that the person is driving or in which the person is a passenger..." So that means that if I drop off a friend at the courthouse—I drop them off, I turn the corner, I drive down the road and I stop for a minute and I pull over—a police officer or a security personnel could search my car and would be able to access the privacy of my vehicle for absolutely no reason.

#### *Interjections.*

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** It doesn't matter what car it is. It's a bit ridiculous that Madame Meilleur wants to talk about the type of car and not the fact that they're breaching someone's section 8 rights. I think you should look at that instead.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I did listen very intently to the remarks of my colleague from Scarborough Southwest. Prior to coming here, of course, he was on city council, indeed a lawyer by profession, and I think he certainly made the case extremely well this afternoon as to why Bill 34, an act to repeal the Public Works Protection Act, is timely, based on the review of Justice McMurtry and the review made by the very distinguished Ombudsman of the province of Ontario, the honourable André Marin.

1700

But specifically, if you look at Ontario today, the three highest security risk targets, I would think, would be our nuclear facilities: one up in Bruce, one in Pickering and one in Darlington. I do know there's lots of chat these days on CBC Newsworld and CNN about the situation in Iran, and we also hear from time to time the activity around the world to acquire technology for dirty bombs. So we do know that our nuclear facilities do need enhanced protection and, certainly, the ability to challenge people that might indeed want to try to get into Ontario's nuclear facilities. I know that is a pressing concern with the members of this Legislature from Durham, and I know certainly for us in Peterborough; we're some 57 kilometres away from Darlington. It's an issue I think that most Ontarians would recognize is a potential security challenge: the need to make sure that we have

adequate provisions in place to provide security for those three nuclear stations that, on any given day, provide about 52% of the generation capacity in the province of Ontario.

So I think all legislators recognize that provisions here are of necessity.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much. We have time for one last question and comment.

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** Thank you, Speaker. I'm pleased to make a few comments on Bill 34, An Act to repeal the Public Works Protection Act, amend the Police Services Act with respect to court security and enact the Security for Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012. I'll pretty much just cover a few points here.

The old Public Works Protection Act included war-time powers for the protection of public works, but it relied too much on the discretion of the minister. The former Minister of Public Safety and Correctional Services in the McGuinty cabinet used that discretion to secretly introduce special powers for police and fostered the widespread confusion that followed by abdication any responsibility to clarify what the law said.

I think in this day and age, any government that operates in secrecy, especially when removing freedoms from its own citizens, needs to be questioned, as I've said earlier. I think we need to operate a government that's open and transparent. That's what democracy is about. It's not about secretly taking freedoms away from citizens like us.

The legislation also removes the minister's discretion to grant special powers of arrest, but it does not address the lack of sound judgment and finger-pointing demonstrated during the G20 by the McGuinty cabinet. It's basically taking responsibility for your actions, and again, I've called upon the government to sincerely apologize and start acting with reason and accountability.

To further the points from our member Mr. Ouellette: What information did the government get to actually cause them to go ahead with this rule? I think that's the point that we need to find out: What tipoff did they get, either from around the world or from our own federal government, as to why they'd have to proceed to enact this law that violated our freedoms?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much. That concludes the time for questions and comments. We return to the member for Scarborough Southwest, who has two minutes to reply.

**Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the comments from the members from Whitby-Oshawa, Bramalea-Gore-Malton, Peterborough and Elgin-Middlesex-London.

If I could make a very quick point in the time remaining, it's that we have struck a very good balance with this bill. I think the criticisms of the bill can be overridden by the fact that we have a Charter of Rights protecting people's liberties and freedom of expression. So we are acting below the Charter of Rights, making sure that our facilities are protected and that old legislation that was

trying to be used, or was used, is repealed and replaced with appropriate legislation regarding our courts and regarding our hydroelectric and nuclear facilities.

I want to just quickly quote something. This is from Minister Meilleur, who introduced the legislation. She said, "We are keeping our commitment to repeal and replace the Public Works Protection Act and adopt a more transparent process. This new, proposed legislation would achieve the important balance between protecting critical facilities and civil liberties."

I cannot underestimate the importance of that quote, because we have struck a balance between both in this legislation. Whether or not the G20 happened, no other government did this prior to us, going back to 1939. So you can criticize us—the opposition can; it is your job—about the fact that this bill wasn't changed, but this bill has been around since 1939. It's a dusty old bill, and it's time to change it. Whether the other parties could have done it, the end result was that we did it. We did it the right way. We had the former Attorney General, Mr. McMurtry, prepare a report. We acted on that report, and the legislation before us is strong and solid.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Pursuant to standing order 47(c), I'm now required to interrupt the proceedings to announce that there has been more than six and a half hours of debate on the motion for second reading of this bill. This debate will therefore be deemed adjourned unless the government House leader or his designate indicates otherwise.

I recognize the Minister of Community Safety.

**Hon. Madeleine Meilleur:** Mr. Speaker, we would like debate to continue.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Further debate?

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** Thank you to the government for allowing debate to continue. I'm going to have to cut this short. I was planning on 20 minutes. Anyway, we'll just hit some of the high spots.

As the member from the governing party said, there is a Charter of Rights and Freedoms which they are going to rely on to—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** I just wish to inform the member that, in fact, he still has 20 minutes for his presentation.

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** Oh, I do? You'll get the long version, then. It won't be the Coles Notes.

**Mr. Jim McDonell:** The long form.

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** It will be the long-form census.

Anyway, we do have a Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and they chose to run roughshod over that with the implementation of that act.

A little bit of history on the bill: I've been reading a book at home about Mitch Hepburn called *Just Call Me Mitch*.

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** St. Thomas.

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** Actually, yes, from St. Thomas—Elgin—Middlesex—London.

Anyway, in the heat of the Second World War, just prior to the Second World War, in 1939, when this bill was implemented, it wasn't implemented without debate.

There was debate in the Legislature by the parties at that time and by all the members who had input. It wasn't a secret bill that was drafted. People were, as you might say in the spirit of the times, concerned about the safety and security of infrastructure and buildings. As I said, it was to include public works, including, at that time, railways, bridges, highways, courthouses, electrical generating facilities, municipal public works and any public work that would also be included and designated by the Lieutenant Governor in Council at that time.

Mr. McMurtry was charged with defining: what a public work was, the scope of the authority to a law enforcement official, public notice requirements and the application of the Public Works Protection Act to significant public events such as major national and international conferences.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, at that time, that bill, when it was debated and brought in in 1939, received debate in this chamber. That's the big point that I think both opposition parties, both the third party and the Progressive Conservative Party, have been trying to make: that this bill should have seen the light of day, and we may not have seen some of the alleged abuses that took place during that weekend. The police had a difficult enough job to do. If this would have been all ironed out ahead of time, people would have known what their parameters were.

Also, we have here with us today the Ombudsman's report on the G20: Caught in the Act—definitely caught in the act.

Chief Justice Roy McMurtry laid out a number of parameters to correct the bill, and I will be supporting this bill, I'd like to say at the outset, at the end of second reading. But I certainly think there are a number of improvements that we could make, and we'd like the minister to address those.

The Public Works Protection Act, which Bill 34 is replacing, served its purpose when it was introduced in 1939, some 71 years ago, like I said, by a Liberal government at that time, the Mitch Hepburn government. We all know by now that the PWPA was introduced during an emergency session of the Ontario Legislative Assembly in response to Canada's entry into World War II and was considered important in supporting that war effort.

The Lieutenant Governor of the day, Albert Matthews—I think a Londoner by name—described the mood of the times as being weighted by "the utmost gravity." Our country was being drawn into the second greatest conflict in the lifetime of many individuals, and the members of this Legislature, at that time, saw the need to enact that legislation that would protect our vital public works and services.

*Interjections.*

1710

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** I'm competing with some other members, Speaker.

Fast forward to 2010, and once again the government of Ontario saw the need to enact the Public Works Protection Act; only, this time, they decided to do it

without any debate in the Ontario Legislative Assembly, choosing rather for a disguised decision-making process that had the net effect of leaving the government, the police and the public all tremendously confused about the actual reach of the law and its greater implications.

Ontario's Ombudsman, André Marin, summed it up best on the very first page of his December 2010 report:

"Regulation 233/10, passed to enhance security during the G20 summit, probably never have been enacted. It was likely unconstitutional. The effect of regulation 233/10, now expired, was to infringe on freedom of expression in ways that do not seem justifiable in a free and democratic society. Specifically, the passage of the regulation triggered the extravagant police authority found in the Public Works Protection Act, including the power to arbitrarily arrest and detain people and to engage in unreasonable searches and seizures. Even apart from the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the legality of regulation 233/10 is doubtful. The Public Works Protection Act under which it was proclaimed authorizes regulations to be created to protect infrastructure, not to provide security to people during events. Regulation 233/10 was therefore probably invalid for having exceeded the authority of that enactment under which it was passed. These problems should have been apparent, and given the tremendous power ... conferred on the police, sober and considered reflection should have been given to whether it was appropriate to arm officers with such authority. This was not done. The decision of the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services to sponsor the regulation was unreasonable."

The Ombudsman goes on to say a number of other things, but I'm going to cut those short. The Ombudsman summed it up nicely when he said, "All of this makes for a sorry legacy."

I don't want to use all of my time focusing on the use of the Public Works Protection Act at the G20. This government knows that it made a mistake in judgment and have now introduced Bill 34 in response. I'm more interested in how this legislation will impact on my riding of Sarnia-Lambton.

Before the Public Works Protection Act was being used to round up civilians and hold people during international summits, the PWSA was designed to protect public works such as utilities and courthouses. At about the same time that this Legislature was debating and passing the Public Works Protection Act in response to World War II, my riding, Sarnia-Lambton, was becoming a centre for the petrochemical industry for the world.

In 1942, Polymer Corp. opened its doors and became the major producer of synthetic rubber that would assist the successful Allied war effort because of the seizure of the rubber plants and the rubber plantations in the Middle East. That history of leadership and innovation by Sarnia-Lambton in the petrochemical and energy sector continues today.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Thank goodness for C.D. Howe.

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** C.D. Howe, the minister of everything. We could use some guys like that today and

get rid of a lot of other ministers. Don't get me started on that. The member from Peterborough and I could have a discussion on that.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** About C.D. Howe.

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** About C.D. Howe and about getting rid of a lot of ministers.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** Yes.

Sarnia-Lambton, as many of you know, is the home of a major petrochemical production complex, a major crude oil refinery, a growing natural gas facility and other feedstock sectors that produce products and energy serving many businesses and communities throughout this province. There are literally hundreds of millions of dollars of investment and production at risk in my community every day, so we can see the value in a public works service agreement where there's protection for those types of facilities. I worked in the Chemical Valley before I had the honour and privilege of being elected in this place, and I have seen the changes after 9/11 in security, monitoring, cameras and fences, so I certainly understand that

Security and safety processes at these facilities are extremely tight. Management is doing everything it can to keep things running smoothly. Yet, on January 21, in the early morning hours, a 28-year-old man wandered into the Hydro One Scott Road transformer station near Sarnia. Before he was apprehended by police, he managed to cut power to over 20,000 area residents as well as several large industrial customers. Imperial Oil, for one, was forced to issue a notification at 6:30 a.m. that same morning that it had lost complete power, using the Chemical Valley emergency coordinating organization system. Immediately, excess flaring was required as a safety precaution at their over-120,000-barrel-a-day facility.

British Petroleum's gas liquids fractionation plant was also forced offline after the break-in at the Hydro One transmission station.

The mayor of Sarnia wrote to the Minister of Energy at that time to express his concerns, and he said in that letter:

"Dear Minister:

"In the early-morning hours of Saturday, January 21, a major power blackout hit Sarnia-Lambton, leaving over 20,000 residents without power for a three-hour period and a number of major industrial locations here, including Imperial Oil, Suncor and BP, without power and had to shut down their operations when this occurred, which is a time-consuming and very expensive process.

"Sarnia Fire Services stood by because a code 8"—which is power loss—"was called and there was above-normal high flaring occurring. In the past, major blackouts have caused tens of millions of dollars to local industry and to the Ontario economy.

"Hydro One, three days after the incident, has not contacted"—this is at that time—"the city of Sarnia to explain the incident, the lack of security, their handling of the situation or to issue an apology to those who were impacted.

"Preliminary information indicates that an individual obtained access to the Hydro One substation and then took other actions which resulted in the blackout. This is of great concern as there appears to be no security at what is one of the most important substations, feeding the largest industrial complex in Ontario. This community was fortunate that the situation did not deteriorate further with a longer power outage" resulting in losses.

"I am formally requesting an independent review of Hydro One and their security in the Sarnia area and I am asking that it be made a priority"—end of quote from the mayor of Sarnia.

These were very serious concerns raised by the mayor. Remember that our Public Utilities Act is the foundation for many, if not all, of our community's most important institutions and functions. What if the power had been knocked out to the local hospital, the airport, the local border crossing or the courthouse?

Unfortunately, the Minister of Energy has decided that it is not in his best interest to look into the security at this substation, according to the mayor.

I hope that, going forward, the minister will have the foresight to protect these important substations, along with all electrical generating facilities and our nuclear facilities in Ontario.

Bill 34 also intends to amend the Police Services Act with respect to court security. This is another issue that touches home in Sarnia-Lambton. The province is amending the right of court security and allowing them to engage in many different types of search in order to increase security at these facilities in my riding of Sarnia-Lambton. They are, however, overlooking a glaring opportunity to increase courthouse safety.

Recently, it was reported by the editor of the Sarnia Observer, Mr. Rod Hilts, that the Sarnia police chief, Phil Nelson, says that he has a perfectly functional weapons detector but lacks funding from the province, and it prevents him from turning it on. In his article in the Sarnia Observer, Mr. Hilts reports:

"Last week, Sarnia Police Chief Phil Nelson said he doesn't have enough funding to staff the weapons detector in the courthouse lobby. This is especially disturbing because shortly before a man had rushed from the public gallery of a courtroom toward a prisoner standing in a box behind a glass barrier. The man had listened while the prisoner" in the box "pleaded guilty to charges of sexual abuse involving a family member, became agitated, and threatened to kill the accused. He was intercepted by officers before reaching the prisoner's box.

"Justice Mark Hornblower said"—in the same article—"the situation could have been worse if a weapon had been involved. The province installed a magnetometer to detect weapons in the courthouse lobby three years ago, but it isn't used. When the alleged abuser returns for sentencing in February, the judge ordered weapons screening for anyone entering the courthouse."

"Once again, Ontario has come up short in its handling of funding for our courthouse"—this is the Observer article. "It would seem obvious that if it's important

enough to install a weapons detector, there should be funds to operate the device.

"The province has downloaded court security costs onto municipalities. Lambton county already pays \$750,000 a year for Sarnia Police Services to provide security officers for each courtroom when in session. The chief says his priorities are the courtrooms, the hallways and the prisoners. You can't blame him for not wanting to go hat in hand to Lambton county council asking for more funding when the responsibility should" rightly "be the province's.

"Sadly, there is insufficient funding for the protection of judges, lawyers and other court staff. While occurrences involving weapons seldom occur here, the fact remains it could happen. There are cases that require a higher level of security, with officers stationed outside the courtroom with hand-held wands to detect weapons...."

1720

"What makes the situation even more ludicrous is the fact that millions of provincial dollars have been spent to upgrade the Sarnia courthouse in recent years. In 2004, the provincial government spent \$500,000 to improve the judges' entrance, install a security card reader, build a fence around the judges' parking lot and secure an elevator for exclusive use by judges and staff. Construction was completed in 2009 on a \$2.7-million project to improve entrance security in the lobby and add security screening capabilities. Two courtrooms were renovated, and the courthouse's surveillance systems were upgraded. The province has earmarked \$125 million toward court security costs in 2012; however, it's not clear how much Sarnia-Lambton will receive."

A perfectly functioning security scanner, left unused by the ministry, because of its willingness to provide adequate funding seems like a substantial oversight on the part of these ministers.

Mr. Speaker, this issue should be remedied immediately so that these people working in these courthouses—not just in Sarnia-Lambton but across Ontario—or those participating in the legal system, like the judges and their staff and the witnesses, can be assured of their safety and not fearful of attacks or violence. I certainly hope that when this government is faced with future opportunities to increase safety in our communities, they will take that initiative.

The act, as we refer to it, that Mr. McMurtry was asked to look at, would define the definition of a public work, the scope of authority conferred to law enforcement officials for the purpose of protecting a public work, public notice requirements relating to the designation of a public work, and also the application of the Public Works Protection Act to significant public events, such as major, national and international conferences and sporting events.

A number of other points were also raised by the critics when they studied this bill. The outdated Public Works Protection Act included those wartime powers for the protection of public works but relied too much on the discretion of the minister. When you think about it, we

had this law in effect since 1939. We seem to have had no difficulty up until this most recent occurrence. So I don't know whether it was the ministers at the time that were in different governments of all different stripes over those years that were able to live with this rule—it was an act, the law; it was on the books. They were able to use it judiciously if it was ever implemented. So why the McGuinty government couldn't have consulted wider when they implemented this act in response to the G20—perhaps it wouldn't have had this observation that happened when there were so many abuses with the secret law with the G20 conference.

In closing, I believe, like many in this Legislature, that what had transpired in the lead up to and during the G20 with respect to the Public Works Protection Act never should have transpired in the first place. All told, the cabinet and the Minister of Community Safety saw fit to intentionally enact a law in a manner that was secretive in its process and intentionally confusing in its explanation. The minister at the time extended the powers of police officials without truly understanding the implications. As a result, more than 1,000 individuals were arrested during the G20 summit, most for little or no reason, and a number of police officers were injured, as well as onlookers.

As such, I'm satisfied to see the dangerous Public Works Protection Act repealed, while at the same time extending the necessary protections to our important public infrastructure and venues like utilities and community court.

I certainly hope that when the bill does come to committee, there will be recommendations and improvements made to it where there are any gaps in protection. I certainly hope that this bill, Bill 34, marks a turning point for this government in its future interaction with the people of Ontario. Open, honest and direct conversation with our communities will help limit any costly and unnecessary events like what transpired at the G20 from having to happen again.

Like I say, Mr. Speaker, in 1939 when the legislators in this very same room were discussing matters of great importance and world events—World War II—many other important decisions were made; they took the time the consult. They took the time to debate in the open and come up with a law that was able to serve that time.

I think that, going forward, if we have any more opportunities like this, the government needs to do everything they can do to satisfy that public debate, that public input, so that we don't see any more travesties like Caught in the Act.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong:** I want to thank the member for Sarnia–Lambton for his presentation. It was very good. I appreciate that.

He mentioned that he's glad to see that the Public Works Protection Act is being repealed. I think that's a consensus in the House; all of us here are glad this act is being repealed. But then the question has to be asked of the new act that's replacing the PWPA: How is that

going to be dissected and looked at with regard to the powers that it's giving court officials as well as the electricity generating facilities and nuclear facilities? We really need to understand the powers that we're giving when we enact this new act, because we don't want the same occurrences happening where people's civil rights are going to be violated.

I want to particularly focus on the court powers. One of the things this act does, in section 2, is that it requires any person entering a courthouse to produce identification and provide information to assess their security risk. I have questions about that. Because if it's open-ended, where do the civil rights of that person come into play and say, "I don't want to answer that question, but I should have the right to come into the courthouse."

What I'd like to know in detail when this act goes to committee is what kind of assessments will be done, what kind of questions will be asked before we give the powers, in this case that I'm talking about, to court security guards. People do have the freedom to enter a courthouse, to be part of the justice system and make sure it's a fair and equitable law.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** It's a pleasure to join the debate and to pass comments on my colleague, the member from Sarnia. I think he brought a very balanced view to the floor today.

This was an event that took place obviously in 2010, and you have to think that the Public Works Protection Act, which is the act that's being overhauled, was passed some 70 years ago. I think that when you look at those two things together, you realize that something has to change. I think we've all come to the conclusion that this needs to be changed, and we've brought in a process that would allow that change to take place.

The G20 summit was held in Toronto. There were a number of areas that were considered. The amount of time that was given for preparation of the site, in my opinion, was very short. I think that the city of Toronto and the province of Ontario could have been given a lot more lead time to come up with what would have been a better security plan. That didn't happen.

I think that any one of the parties, over the past 70 years when the previous act was in place, could have brought the act to the table and could have amended that act. That didn't take place. What did take place, in the opinion of some, was that the act was brought in to enforce what was an event taking place in Toronto that we hadn't seen the likes of, certainly, since I've lived in the GTA.

I think the image of the burning police car that we all saw on TV was something which certainly, to me, was foreign. It was something that I had seen on TV before but had never seen in my own community, and it was something that we as Ontarians and Canadians thought we didn't want to see anymore.

I want to compliment those members of the police services that did acquit themselves in an honourable way. Within any organization you have good people and bad

people; that goes throughout many organizations. In this case, I think those men and women who do protect us on a daily basis should be praised for their actions in this regard and that this report from Justice McMurtry should move forward, Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jim McDonell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for letting me address the comments of my colleague from Sarnia-Lambton. I think he brought up some good points when he mentioned that, although this law has been on the books for some 77 years, over all that time we haven't had an issue where this party has seen the need to change the act. I guess it's become clear that you can't trust all governments to use it wisely—and really, that is the question. It's not the fact that the act is old; it's how it was used to enact a situation in this province that we all seem to have a concerted agreement here that it wasn't right. There were civil liberties put down in the back room without public debate.

1730

Even in 1939—we talked about different times on the eve of war—even the Legislature at that time saw the need for public and open debate. I think that's really the issue around here. We see now the problems that were caused by making those decisions in the back room. First of all, the public was not aware of it, so they didn't have time to input, and by that time there was no time to have that debate, possibly. But when you don't let people know what the laws are, it's hard for them to follow them. In a lot of cases, that was the real reason behind it.

It is interesting to note some of things that have been forgotten behind this, and that's some of our important infrastructure in this province. We think back to 1939. Certainly, the infrastructure that was around was limited in terms of what we have today. Communications today—it would really cripple the country if we lost some of the networks that really weren't there 70 years ago. But whether it be the network or—as we see some of the impact we had with the hydro station in Sarnia, the economic challenges are there if they're not properly looked after. So we're looking forward to supporting this bill to see some of these changes.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** Rising again to speak to this issue, we've achieved a consensus in the House with respect to the benefit of repealing the outdated Public Works Protection Act. That speaks to a step in the right direction for this House working together and achieving a consensus on a law that was improperly applied and is no longer relevant in this time and day, a law that resulted in egregious human rights violations and civil liberty violations as well.

Moving forward, let's ensure that there is a consensus in this House with respect to how this bill is enacted, with respect to how the regulations or the specific sections of this bill are brought into force and how they're implemented, because there are many concerns

that have been raised in this House, by both the members of the opposition and members of the NDP caucus, that must be implemented for this bill to be a fair bill, to account for the civil liberties and the interests of democracy in Ontario.

I urge the government to heed the warnings on this side of the House to ensure that the bill that will come into force is one that represents Ontarians, that represents democracy, that represents a proper society in Ontario and ensures that there are public courthouses, that people have the right to discourse, the right to dissent, both in courthouses and in and around electricity-producing facilities while maintaining a rational and reasonable limitation for protection.

I stress the fact that whenever we talk about security, we must always apply a rational and reasonable lens.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** I'll now return to the member for Sarnia-Lambton to respond.

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** Thank you. It has been a pleasure to have an opportunity to address this bill today—an important bill, I think, for public safety across Ontario and especially in my riding of Sarnia-Lambton, as well as many of our facilities across Ontario.

I'd like to thank the member from London-Fanshawe, the member from Oakville, the member from Stormont-Dundas-South Glengarry and also the member for Bramalea-Gore-Malton for their kind and insightful remarks and also for pointing out where, if I might have missed something—they obviously picked up on it.

Just summing up, the outdated Public Works Protection Act, where this all arose from, relied a lot on the discretion of the minister. Obviously, the minister at the time, when we had these issues during the G20, didn't use that type of discretion. Obviously, there was a failure to act, to properly oversee the people who reported to him. Those special powers that were granted to the police—obviously there was a lack of communication.

I think the big point that's been communicated throughout here today is, when you try to do something in secret and behind closed doors and there's not enough public debate—there's nothing like the clear light of day on any issue to bring those types of issues to debate, to bring answers to the floor so people have an opportunity from all three parties and the general public to say, "Well, wait a minute. What about if this happens, how do we react to that?"

I think we're trying to be too smart by half. When they did this, it came back to bite them. As the Ombudsman said, "Caught in the Act." Those are his words, not mine. What more damning indictment can you get than the well-respected Ombudsman—

**Mr. Toby Barrett:** He does have a way with words.

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** Anyway, we've got air Ornge, too. What's going on there every day? Anyway, it seems like—stay tuned.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Further debate?

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** I'm happy to be here today to talk about government Bill 34, the Security for Courts,

Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012.

I, like others here today, am supportive of repealing the PWPA, but I want to spend my time here talking about one of the most shocking examples that happened during the G20 summit to one of my constituents. I'm sure many of you have heard from constituents in your riding, but I think this story is probably one of the most too-shocking events that happened during that time.

This story is about John and Sarah Pruyn. John Pruyn is married to Susan Pruyn. They have a daughter, Sarah, who attended Guelph university at the time. John Pruyn resides in a rural portion of my riding. He's 57 years old. I know the family very well. They're peaceful, law-abiding members of my riding. They're active in the community. Susan Pruyn, the wife, is very active in preserving health care in the Niagara region and across the province. They're hard-working folks who run a part-time Christmas tree farm in the riding. John actually was a federal employee. He worked for Revenue Canada.

He came to Toronto for the G20 summit. He landed up on the lands of Queen's Park, actually right outside of the office that I currently reside in. He thought that that would be a pretty safe place to be. It was outside of the perimeter. Protests happen every day at Queen's Park, seven days a week, 24 hours a day, sometimes when we're here and sometimes when we're not.

He was sitting on the lawn, having some discussions about health care and poverty, those kinds of issues, with his daughter and a couple of young people, when a corral by the police happened around him. He wasn't even standing. Now, John is disabled. He has a prosthesis for his one leg that he lost in a farming accident a number of years ago. He walks with a walking cane.

The police actually basically told him to get up and get moving, and when he wasn't able to do that immediately, the police then took another stance and they actually accused him of resisting arrest. They pulled his walking sticks away from him. They tied his hands behind his back, and they ripped off his prosthetic leg.

Then they told him to get up and hop. When he wasn't able to hop on one leg, they dragged him across the pavement. They tore the skin off his elbows with his hands still tied behind his back. They knocked his glasses off his head. They accused him of spitting, something that John would never do. He spent 27 hours in detention, five without any water in the heat of the day. His daughter, as well, was arrested and detained for that period of time.

It turned out that John and his daughter made a bad assumption because where they thought they would be protected here at Queen's Park, where government happens, it wasn't the case for them.

1740

The daughter pleaded with the police to give her father a little bit of time so he could get up on his feet and put his prosthesis back on and get out of there, but they refused to do that. One of the police officers used his knee to press down on John's head. Now, here's a man

with a disability who wasn't going anywhere. He said in an interview to Doug Draper, a local reporter in Niagara, that his head hurt for a week.

John's story is, I think, one of the most shocking stories that happened during that period of time, and his nightmare continued for 27 hours. He's not a young man. He's an amputee. He's not a troublemaker. And, you know, it begs the question why he was arrested; why 1,100 people were arrested in the first place.

He was never given a reason for his arrest, and when he was being kicked and handcuffed he asked that, but he never got any answers. The police just continued to yell at him that he was resisting arrest. Then, after 27 hours, a court officer approached him at the detention centre and told him that he should not still be there in that steel cage.

His daughter as well was detained for 24 hours. No one was given the opportunity to make a phone call. I mean, any time someone is arrested, even those of us who aren't lawyers know that you're entitled to a phone call. Should they have not had that opportunity?

He was never read his rights. He never received an answer to his questions. He was never charged with anything.

There was another person, which was I think the second shocking story, who was in a wheelchair and was bound to that wheelchair because he was paralyzed on one side, and he was begging over and over again for a washroom break, which he was denied.

Other people were begging for water and making futile pleas for a phone call to call their parents so they didn't worry. Mrs. Pruyn—Susan—was frantic because her husband and her daughter were supposed to meet her at the subway station and they didn't show up for many, many hours.

So what was this all about and why were John and Sarah Pruyn arrested if they were part of the gathering of a peaceful demonstration at Queen's Park? Was their crime to dare to come to Toronto in the first place and to join with those whose concerns about the G20 were needing to be expressed? Mr. Pruyn wondered if the idea of the crackdown was to send a message to the public at large that gatherings of opposition views won't be tolerated.

Susan Pruyn asked for an inquiry. Andrea Horwath put forward a private member's bill. That hasn't happened at this point in time. Mr. Pruyn wonders if the whole idea was that we don't have the right to assemble anymore here in our great Canadian country. If you don't have the right to assemble, if that assembly is about questioning the policies of our government and a global economy, then it's little use anymore for acts of democracy at a regional or a national level. Why else would riot squads spend more time going after peaceful protesters than they did going after the people who were actually committing crimes? And what happened here? It was excessive police violence, and they didn't try and control the crowd.

The story a year and a half later: Mr. Pruyn is in the final stages of dealing with a human rights complaint. After he filed his complaint asking for settlement for the

pain, suffering and anguish that he incurred during that weekend, he was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder, and he's had to retire from his job at Revenue Canada because of that. But he's not going to give up what he feels is his right as a Canadian to peacefully assemble: "I will still go out [to public demonstrations]. It is part of my charter of rights."

Many of the people who were actually arrested in areas that were supposed to be safe zones, like Queen's Park, were here to talk about how the G20 summit and the gathering of leaders was going to affect issues like health care, jobs and poverty. Unfortunately, this tragedy that happened on this weekend was a shameful abuse of power. There were legal observers that were trained, actually, by the Canadian civil liberties group and by the Movement Defence Committee—hundreds of them trained in a one-day training session—to kind of assist people who may have been detained, who maybe needed a legal hotline number, and to make sure people had the right to express themselves in a peaceful way. One of those legal observers was even arrested when he went to check up on somebody that was reported as kind of being lost to the crowd.

As I say, people have the right to participate. They have the right to demonstrate. They have the right to congregate. What happened that weekend was really just about instilling fear in that whole democratic process.

So I think that we still have concerns about the new bill that's coming forward with respect to some of the same issues around what kind of information will be asked and what kind of search and seizure processes there will be. They need to be very clear. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much. Questions and comments?

**Hon. John Milloy:** I'm pleased to continue participating in the debate with some comments in response to the presentation that was made by the member from Welland.

Mr. Speaker, no one in the House, when they heard the story and a number of stories that were shared with us, would in any way want to diminish those stories. Obviously, all of us who, through the media and other reports, learned of some of the events that happened around the G20, recognize the fact that there were some major problems that took place. There have been various investigations and follow-up on some of these incidents.

But Mr. Speaker, I go back to a point that I made earlier when I participating in questions and comments—and I anticipate the heckles that I'll hear—and that is why it is so hard for people to acknowledge the fact that this was a federal conference. It was a conference that was hosted by the government of Canada, with 20 leaders from around the world, including individuals like the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, people who are targets of terrorism, who need a fair amount of security—I think we all recognize that—and the federal government put in place a security framework, co-operating with local police

enforcement and co-operating with the province of Ontario. But the federal government is ultimately responsible for what happened with the G20.

Our piece of the puzzle was a small piece that had to do with a piece of legislation, the Public Works Protection Act, which goes back to the Second World War. As a government, we have acknowledged there are flaws with that act. We asked an esteemed jurist, the former Chief Justice of Ontario, the Honourable Roy McMurtry, to look into it, and we are coming forward with a piece of legislation to replace that and to reflect more of the modern balance between security and personal freedom.

But Mr. Speaker, I find it outrageous that somehow, when you stand up and point out that this was a federal conference, the federal government had full responsibility for it, and the federal government was directing security, that somehow you're heckled and people say that there's something wrong with that. That is a statement of fact.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Bill Walker:** It's interesting, the minister, today, again has to stand up and find fault and blame with someone else. It's either Mr. Harper or it's Alberta or I think we even said that maybe Obama was part of the problem now. You know, part of this is just recognizing—you actually finally said that you recognize mistakes were made, so that's a big leap forward, which is really nice to see for a change. But what we'd really like to see is you accept responsibility and put some actions in place to change it. Why are we debating this bill if there's nothing wrong and it's everybody else's fault?

There are obviously challenges. There are issues. In this House, we need to talk about it, we need to have civil debate and we need to get on with making actions that are going to make this better for another time, because you've obviously boondoggled this one as well.

I would like to congratulate my colleague Cindy Forster from Welland, however, in a couple of the comments I think I heard out there: trust; the discretion not to abuse power. Again, I see some themes throughout the whole day today: abuse of power; Ornge; the Green Energy Act. You need to not just ram things through. You need to ask other people. As you collectively always say, we want partnership, we want collaboration. We're here offering it and we're willing to do that.

Poor Mr. Pruyn—27 hours of unnecessary duress. All they needed was a smidgen—a little smidgen—of common sense to say, "This is abusing our power. We're taking this way to the extreme." We do not and cannot accept that, Mr. Speaker. We need to always have balance when it comes to safety and security. We need to ensure that certainly our courts, our nuclear facilities and other facilities that we provide as government are safe and secure, but there's a modicum of balance here. It's like regulation. We put abattoirs out of business because of overregulation. This is another indictment of a government that's lost touch. They want to talk all the time but they don't want to do it.

1750

You've asked Mr. Drummond for a report, and you're not going to put his recommendations in. You've asked Mr. McMurtry his recommendations. One of these times I just wish you'd step up, admit your guilt and say, "We will do the right thing," and remove the discretion from the minister.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** I was struck with the details of the story shared by the member from Welland, the painful story of an individual who was already facing special needs in terms of mobility restrictions. The fact that this individual was treated with such disrespect, treated as if he was inhuman, is utterly deplorable and is despicable and is a disgrace. It's an embarrassment on this province. It's an embarrassment on this city. It's an embarrassment to be in Canada when such actions happen.

But let's speak about the trend here. There is a trend in this government with an attempt to either not take responsibility or to discourage any attempt to highlight misconduct or misuse of power. In fact, we can tie this in to the Ontario Ombudsman's report, where he made it very clear, in addressing police accountability, that he had previously criticized the SIU director for not taking proper steps. But this time in his report the Ombudsman indicated that it was the Attorney General's office and ministry that discouraged the SIU director from investigating police misconduct. There seems to be a trend in this government that they are not interested in uncovering misconduct, that they're not interested in protecting the rights of Ontarians, that they're not interested in protecting civil liberties.

Why is it the Attorney General discouraged the SIU director from investigating police misconduct? And why is this government not able to accept the responsibility for enacting a law which resulted in mass civil liberty violations?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti:** I think more importantly than anything else, it's important to see that we are acting. We are acting quite strongly today and throughout this debate; we are bringing in a new piece of legislation.

Again, what happened back when the G20 occurred was unexpected. Now, we can put the finger of blame on anyone you want to blame, but the fact is, we acted. We didn't sit back and say, "You know what? Let's just forget about this and move on to other things. Let's deal with the Drummond report and let's deal with the \$16-billion deficit," but are moving with serious changes.

Again, as I stated earlier, when the NDP was in government in the 1990s and when the Conservatives were in power since 1939—they'd been in power a long time, since 1939—they did nothing to change this bill. The bill stood as it was for all this period of time.

We have grasped this old bill that's been around—the Public Works Protection Act—and taken the recommendations of Justice McMurtry, a former Attorney General as well, and are repealing the Public Works Protection Act and amending the act regarding court security and bringing in a whole new bill regarding the protection of nuclear facilities and also other power generating facilities.

So we are modernizing old bills, old acts, and repealing ones that are no longer necessary. We do this on the advice of our stakeholders; we've talked to stakeholders. We do it on the advice of a very well written report by former Chief Justice McMurtry. We've come out with a result. Obviously, this bill will go to committee, where it can be subject to further changes. But we're doing the right thing and I'm proud we're doing that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** The member for Welland has two minutes to reply.

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I heard a couple of things from the government members. One was, earlier, there wasn't enough time to properly implement security plans. Well, in fact, there's documentation showing that for 18 months the police were infiltrating agencies and community groups around the plan for the G20 summit.

The other was that other governments have never changed the bill, but there was no need to change the bill because it was actually regulation 233/10 that was enacted that actually caused the issues. So there was no reason to change it before then.

It was that this was a secret was the problem, and that it wasn't communicated to people. This was an intentional, planned abuse of authority and power, a violation of our rights and our freedoms, and was unconstitutional in every way.

So I look forward to actually getting to committee with this bill. We'll be supporting the bill. I look forward to making some changes that we addressed with respect to the courts, in particular, with respect to search and seizure and the information and the identification that you need to provide when you're attending a public building.

Both levels of government hold responsibility for this, because it was the provincial government that actually passed the regulation. It may have been a federal summit, but the provincial government passed it, and they didn't communicate it, not even to the other members of the other parties who are elected to represent people in this province.

Had the information been debated in a thoughtful way, we probably could have avoided many of the actions that happened on that weekend of the G20 summit.

*Second reading debate deemed adjourned.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ted Arnott):** Thank you very much. It being very close to six of the clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 9 a.m.

*The House adjourned at 1756.*

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: Hon. / L'hon. David C. Onley, O.Ont.

Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Dave Levac

Clerk / Greffière: Deborah Deller

Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman, Tonia Grannum

Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Albanese, Laura (LIB)	York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston	
Armstrong, Teresa J. (NDP)	London–Fanshawe	
<b>Arnott, Ted (PC)</b>	Wellington–Halton Hills	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée
Bailey, Robert (PC)	Sarnia–Lambton	
<b>Balkissoon, Bas (LIB)</b>	Scarborough–Rouge River	Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée Deputy Speaker / Vice-président
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand–Norfolk	
<b>Bartolucci, Hon. / L'hon. Rick (LIB)</b>	Sudbury	Chair of Cabinet / Président du Conseil des ministres Minister of Northern Development and Mines / Ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
<b>Bentley, Hon. / L'hon. Christopher (LIB)</b>	London West / London-Ouest	Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie
Berardinetti, Lorenzo (LIB)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	
<b>Best, Hon. / L'hon. Margaret R. (LIB)</b>	Scarborough–Guildwood	Minister of Consumer Services / Ministre des Services aux consommateurs
Bisson, Gilles (NDP)	Timmins–James Bay / Timmins–Baie James	House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire de parti reconnu
<b>Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (LIB)</b>	St. Catharines	Minister of the Environment / Ministre de l'Environnement Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
<b>Brotten, Hon. / L'hon. Laurel C. (LIB)</b>	Etobicoke–Lakeshore	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation Minister Responsible for Women's Issues / Ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Campbell, Sarah (NDP)	Kenora–Rainy River	
Cansfield, Donna H. (LIB)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	
<b>Chan, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Markham–Unionville	Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport / Ministre de Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport
<b>Chiarelli, Hon. / L'hon. Bob (LIB)</b>	Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Minister of Infrastructure / Ministre de l'Infrastructure Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Halton	
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds–Grenville	
Colle, Mike (LIB)	Eglinton–Lawrence	
Coteau, Michael (LIB)	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	
Crack, Grant (LIB)	Glengarry–Prescott–Russell	
Craiton, Kim (LIB)	Niagara Falls	
Damerla, Dipika (LIB)	Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville	
Delaney, Bob (LIB)	Mississauga–Streetsville	
Dhillon, Vic (LIB)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Dickson, Joe (LIB)	Ajax–Pickering	
DiNovo, Cheri (NDP)	Parkdale–High Park	
<b>Duguid, Hon. / L'hon. Brad (LIB)</b>	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Minister of Economic Development and Innovation / Ministre du Développement économique et de l'Innovation
<b>Duncan, Hon. / L'hon. Dwight (LIB)</b>	Windsor–Tecumseh	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / Président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement Deputy Premier / Vice-premier ministre Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances
Dunlop, Garfield (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	
Elliott, Christine (PC)	Whitby–Oshawa	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Fedeli, Victor (PC)	Nipissing	
Flynn, Kevin Daniel (LIB)	Oakville	
Forster, Cindy (NDP)	Welland	Deputy House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire adjointe de parti reconnu
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	
<b>Gerretsen, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles	Attorney General / Procureur général
<b>Gravelle, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Thunder Bay–Superior North / Thunder Bay–Superior-Nord	Minister of Natural Resources / Ministre des Richesses naturelles
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	
Harris, Michael (PC)	Kitchener–Conestoga	
Hillier, Randy (PC)	Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington	
Horwath, Andrea (NDP)	Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre	Leader, Recognized Party / Chef de parti reconnu Leader, New Democratic Party of Ontario / Chef du Nouveau parti démocratique de l'Ontario
<b>Hoskins, Hon. / L'hon. Eric (LIB)</b>	St. Paul's	Minister of Children and Youth Services / Ministre des Services à l'enfance et à la jeunesse
Hudak, Tim (PC)	Niagara West–Glanbrook / Niagara-Ouest–Glanbrook	Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle Leader, Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur de l'Ontario
Jackson, Rod (PC)	Barrie	
Jaczek, Helena (LIB)	Oak Ridges–Markham	
<b>Jeffrey, Hon. / L'hon. Linda (LIB)</b>	Brampton–Springdale	Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail Minister Responsible for Seniors / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires des personnes âgées
Jones, Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin–Caledon	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Klees, Frank (PC)	Newmarket–Aurora	
Kwinter, Monte (LIB)	York Centre / York-Centre	
Leal, Jeff (LIB)	Peterborough	
Leone, Rob (PC)	Cambridge	
<b>Levac, Hon. / L'hon. Dave (LIB)</b>	Brant	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
MacCharles, Tracy (LIB)	Pickering–Scarborough East / Pickering–Scarborough-Est	
MacLaren, Jack (PC)	Carleton–Mississippi Mills	
MacLeod, Lisa (PC)	Nepean–Carleton	
Mangat, Amrit (LIB)	Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud	
Mantha, Michael (NDP)	Algoma–Manitoulin	
Marchese, Rosario (NDP)	Trinity–Spadina	
<b>Matthews, Hon. / L'hon. Deborah (LIB)</b>	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / Ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Mauro, Bill (LIB)	Thunder Bay–Atikokan	
McDonell, Jim (PC)	Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry	
<b>McGuinty, Hon. / L'hon. Dalton (LIB)</b>	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales Premier / Premier ministre Leader, Government / Chef du gouvernement Leader, Liberal Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti libéral de l'Ontario
McKenna, Jane (PC)	Burlington	
<b>McMeekin, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (LIB)</b>	Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough–Westdale	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
McNaughton, Monte (PC)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	
McNeely, Phil (LIB)	Ottawa–Orléans	
<b>Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (LIB)</b>	Ottawa–Vanier	Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / Ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones
Miller, Norm (PC)	Parry Sound–Muskoka	
<b>Miller, Paul (NDP)</b>	Hamilton East–Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est–Stoney Creek	Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Milligan, Rob E. (PC) <b>Millroy, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Northumberland—Quinte West Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	Minister of Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Moridi, Reza (LIB) <b>Munro, Julia (PC)</b>	Richmond Hill York—Simcoe	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Murray, Hon. / L'hon. Glen R. (LIB)</b>	Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Naqvi, Yasir (LIB)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	
Natyshak, Taras (NDP)	Essex	
Nicholls, Rick (PC)	Chatham—Kent—Essex	
O'Toole, John (PC)	Durham	
Oraziotti, David (LIB)	Sault Ste. Marie	
Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Oshawa	
Pettapiece, Randy (PC)	Perth—Wellington	
Piruzza, Teresa (LIB)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	
Prue, Michael (NDP)	Beaches—East York	
Qaadri, Shafiq (LIB)	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	
Sandals, Liz (LIB)	Guelph	
Schein, Jonah (NDP)	Davenport	
Scott, Laurie (PC)	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	
Sergio, Mario (LIB)	York West / York-Ouest	
Shurman, Peter (PC)	Thornhill	
Singh, Jagmeet (NDP)	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	
Smith, Todd (PC)	Prince Edward—Hastings	
Sorbara, Greg (LIB)	Vaughan	
<b>Sousa, Hon. / L'hon. Charles (LIB)</b>	Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration / Ministre des Affaires civiques et de l'Immigration
Tabuns, Peter (NDP)	Toronto—Danforth	
<b>Takhar, Hon. / L'hon. Harinder S. (LIB)</b>	Mississauga—Erindale	Minister of Government Services / Ministre des Services gouvernementaux
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain	
Thompson, Lisa M. (PC)	Huron—Bruce	
Vanthof, John (NDP)	Timiskaming—Cochrane	
Walker, Bill (PC)	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	
Wilson, Jim (PC)	Simcoe—Grey	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle
Witmer, Elizabeth (PC)	Kitchener—Waterloo	
Wong, Soo (LIB)	Scarborough—Agincourt	
<b>Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (LIB)</b>	Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Yakabuski, John (PC)	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	
Yurek, Jeff (PC)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	
Zimmer, David (LIB)	Willowdale	

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Standing Committee on Estimates / Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses**

Chair / Président: Michael Prue  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Taras Natyshak  
Grant Crack, Kim Craiton  
Vic Dhillon, Michael Harris  
Rob Leone, Taras Natyshak  
Rick Nicholls, Michael Prue  
Mario Sergio  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs /  
Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Bob Delaney  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Teresa Piruzza  
Bob Delaney, Victor Fedeli  
Cindy Forster, Monte McNaughton  
Yasir Naqvi, Teresa Piruzza  
Michael Prue, Peter Shurman  
Soo Wong  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on General Government / Comité  
permanent des affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: David Orazietti  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: David Zimmer  
Sarah Campbell, Michael Coteau  
Joe Dickson, Rosario Marchese  
David Orazietti, Laurie Scott  
Todd Smith, Jeff Yurek  
David Zimmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przedziecki

**Standing Committee on Government Agencies / Comité  
permanent des organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Président: Vacant  
Donna H. Cansfield, Helena Jaczek  
Bill Mauro, Jim McDonell  
Phil McNeely, Randy Pettapiece  
Peter Tabuns, Monique Taylor  
Lisa M. Thompson  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Justice Policy / Comité permanent de  
la justice**

Chair / Présidente: Laura Albanese  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Shafiq Qaadi  
Laura Albanese, Teresa J. Armstrong  
Lorenzo Berardinetti, Mike Colle  
Frank Klees, Jack MacLaren  
Paul Miller, Rob E. Milligan  
Shafiq Qaadi  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly / Comité  
permanent de l'Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: Garfield Dunlop  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Lisa MacLeod  
Laura Albanese, Bas Balkissoon  
Gilles Bisson, Donna H. Cansfield  
Steve Clark, Garfield Dunlop  
Jeff Leal, Lisa MacLeod  
Jonah Schein  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts / Comité permanent  
des comptes publics**

Chair / Président: Norm Miller  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Toby Barrett  
Toby Barrett, France Gélinas  
Phil McNeely, Norm Miller  
Reza Moridi, Jerry J. Ouellette  
Liz Sandals, Jagmeet Singh  
David Zimmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills / Comité  
permanent des règlements et des projets de loi d'intérêt privé**

Chair / Président: Peter Tabuns  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: John Vanthof  
Michael Coteau, Grant Crack  
Vic Dhillon, Randy Hillier  
Rod Jackson, Mario Sergio  
Peter Tabuns, John Vanthof  
Bill Walker  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Tamara Pomanski

**Standing Committee on Social Policy / Comité permanent de  
la politique sociale**

Chair / Président: Ernie Hardeman  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Ted Chudleigh  
Ted Chudleigh, Dipika Damerla  
Cheri DiNovo, Kevin Daniel Flynn  
Ernie Hardeman, Tracy MacCharles  
Amrit Mangat, Michael Mantha  
Jane McKenna  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch

*Continued from back cover*

<b>Renewable energy</b>	
Mr. Bill Walker .....	845
<b>National Farmers Union</b>	
Mr. Taras Natyshak .....	845
<b>Darlington nuclear generating station</b>	
Mr. Joe Dickson .....	846
<b>Durham College</b>	
Mrs. Christine Elliott .....	846
<b>Education</b>	
Mr. Bas Balkissoon .....	846
<b>Lauren Hanna</b>	
Ms. Lisa M. Thompson .....	847
<b>Private members' public business</b>	
The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac) .....	847

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS / DÉPÔT DES PROJETS DE LOI

<b>Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Roadside Assistance Vehicles), 2012, Bill 38, Mr. Dunlop / Loi de 2012 modifiant le Code de la route (véhicules d'assistance routière), projet de loi 38, M. Dunlop</b>	
First reading agreed to .....	847
Mr. Garfield Dunlop .....	847

## PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS

<b>Renewable energy</b>	
Mr. John O'Toole .....	847
<b>Dog ownership</b>	
Ms. Cheri DiNovo .....	848
<b>School closures</b>	
Ms. Lisa M. Thompson .....	848
<b>Diagnostic services</b>	
Mme France Gélinas .....	848
<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. Bill Walker .....	848
<b>Baitfish industry</b>	
Ms. Sarah Campbell .....	849
<b>Education funding</b>	
Mr. Phil McNeely .....	849
<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. John O'Toole .....	849
<b>Hydro rates</b>	
Mr. Michael Mantha .....	849
<b>Renewable energy</b>	
Mr. Jeff Yurek .....	850

<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. Michael Harris .....	850
<b>Eye examinations</b>	
Mr. Victor Fedeli .....	850

## ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

<b>Security for Courts, Electricity Generating Facilities and Nuclear Facilities Act, 2012, Bill 34, Mrs. Meilleur / Loi de 2012 sur la sécurité des tribunaux, des centrales électriques et des installations nucléaires, projet de loi 34, Mme Meilleur</b>	
Mr. Phil McNeely .....	851
Mr. Bill Walker .....	853
Mr. Taras Natyshak .....	853
Mrs. Liz Sandals .....	854
Mr. Jim McDonell .....	854
Mr. Phil McNeely .....	854
Mr. Jim McDonell .....	855
Mr. Paul Miller .....	857
Hon. John Milloy .....	858
Mr. Toby Barrett .....	858
Mr. Michael Prue .....	858
Mr. Jim McDonell .....	859
Mr. Michael Prue .....	859
Mr. Jeff Yurek .....	862
Mr. Paul Miller .....	862
Mr. David Zimmer .....	862
Ms. Lisa MacLeod .....	862
Mr. Michael Prue .....	863
Mr. David Zimmer .....	863
Mr. Michael Harris .....	866
Mr. Taras Natyshak .....	866
Hon. Christopher Bentley .....	866
Mr. Garfield Dunlop .....	866
Mr. David Zimmer .....	867
Mr. Norm Miller .....	867
Mr. Jagmeet Singh .....	870
Mr. Jim McDonell .....	870
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong .....	870
Hon. Christopher Bentley .....	871
Mr. Norm Miller .....	871
Mr. Peter Tabuns .....	871
Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn .....	874
Mr. Jerry J. Ouellette .....	874
Mr. John Vanthof .....	875
Mr. Jeff Leal .....	875
Mr. Peter Tabuns .....	875
Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti .....	875

Mrs. Christine Elliott .....	878
Mr. Jagmeet Singh .....	878
Mr. Jeff Leal .....	879
Mr. Jeff Yurek .....	879
Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti .....	879
Mr. Robert Bailey .....	880
Ms. Teresa J. Armstrong .....	883
Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn .....	883
Mr. Jim McDonell .....	884
Mr. Jagmeet Singh .....	884
Mr. Robert Bailey .....	884
Ms. Cindy Forster .....	884
Hon. John Milloy .....	886
Mr. Bill Walker .....	886
Mr. Jagmeet Singh .....	887
Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti .....	887
Ms. Cindy Forster .....	887
Second reading debate deemed adjourned .....	887

## CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Monday 5 March 2012 / Lundi 5 mars 2012

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Mr. Monte McNaughton .....	833
Mr. Gilles Bisson .....	833
Mr. Peter Shurman .....	833
Hon. Brad Duguid .....	833
Mr. Reza Moridi .....	833
Hon. Glen R. Murray .....	833
Mr. Kim Craitor .....	833
Mr. Bob Delaney .....	833
Mr. Jagmeet Singh .....	833
The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac) .....	833

### ORAL QUESTIONS / QUESTIONS ORALES

#### Renewable energy

Mr. Tim Hudak .....	834
Hon. Christopher Bentley .....	834

#### Air ambulance service

Mr. Tim Hudak .....	834
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	835

#### Job creation

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	835
Hon. Brad Duguid .....	835

#### Job creation

Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	836
Hon. Dwight Duncan .....	836

#### Air ambulance service

Mr. Frank Klees .....	837
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	837

#### Air ambulance service

Mme France Gélinas .....	837
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	837

#### Immigration policy

Ms. Dipika Damerla .....	838
Hon. Charles Sousa .....	838

#### Air ambulance service

Mr. Frank Klees .....	838
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	839

#### Air ambulance service

Mr. Taras Natyshak .....	839
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	839

#### Prescription drug abuse

Mr. Jeff Leal .....	840
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	840

#### Air ambulance service

Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer .....	840
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	840

#### Darlington nuclear generating station

Mr. Peter Tabuns .....	841
Hon. Christopher Bentley .....	841

#### Senior citizens

Mr. Michael Coteau .....	841
Hon. Linda Jeffrey .....	841

#### Renewable energy

Mr. Victor Fedeli .....	842
Hon. Christopher Bentley .....	842

#### Ontario Northland Transportation Commission

Mr. Gilles Bisson .....	842
Hon. Rick Bartolucci .....	842

#### Transportation infrastructure

Mrs. Teresa Piruzza .....	843
Hon. Bob Chiarelli .....	843

#### Private Members' motions

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac) .....	843
-------------------------------------	-----

### DEFERRED VOTES / VOTES DIFFÉRÉS

#### Attracting Investment and Creating Jobs Act, 2012, Bill 11, Mr. Duguid / Loi de 2012 visant à attirer les investissements et à créer des emplois, projet de loi 11, M. Duguid

Second reading agreed to .....	844
--------------------------------	-----

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Mr. Jagmeet Singh .....	844
-------------------------	-----

### MEMBERS' STATEMENTS / DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS

#### Highway accident

Mr. Randy Pettapiece .....	844
----------------------------	-----

#### University of Waterloo DIRECTIONS program

Ms. Sarah Campbell .....	845
--------------------------	-----

#### Global Community Alliance

Mr. Phil McNeely .....	845
------------------------	-----

*Continued on inside back cover*



No. 21

N° 21

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario**

First Session, 40<sup>th</sup> Parliament

**Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 40<sup>e</sup> législature

**Official Report  
of Debates  
(Hansard)**

**Journal  
des débats  
(Hansard)**

**Tuesday 6 March 2012**

**Mardi 6 mars 2012**



**Speaker**  
Honourable Dave Levac

**Président**  
L'honorable Dave Levac

**Clerk**  
Deborah Deller

**Greffière**  
Deborah Deller

### **Hansard on the Internet**

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

### **Index inquiries**

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

### **Le Journal des débats sur Internet**

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

### **Renseignements sur l'index**

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 6 March 2012

# ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

Mardi 6 mars 2012

*The House met at 0900.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Please join me in prayer.

*Prayers.*

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### FAMILY CAREGIVER LEAVE ACT (EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS AMENDMENT), 2012

### LOI DE 2012 SUR LE CONGÉ FAMILIAL POUR LES AIDANTS NATURELS (MODIFICATION DES NORMES D'EMPLOI)

Resuming the debate adjourned on February 27, 2012, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 30, An Act to amend the Employment Standards Act, 2000 in respect of family caregiver leave / Projet de loi 30, Loi modifiant la Loi de 2000 sur les normes d'emploi en ce qui concerne le congé familial pour les aidants naturels.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further debate?

**Mrs. Laura Albanese:** I am pleased to rise and continue the debate for the second reading of the Family Caregiver Leave Act (Employment Standards Amendment), 2012.

In previous conversations on this bill here in this House, we heard a variety of comments and opinions brought forward by a number of members from all sides of the House. There is no doubt that one of the principles that unites us is the need for compassion for our loved ones when they face a medical crisis. I believe that we heard that loud and clear. That is because everyone in this House, and those who may be following these proceedings from home, agrees that when loved ones face a serious illness or injury, we need to be at their side, we need to care for and to reassure those that we are closest to—our family.

The well-known theologian Thomas Merton once wrote that “the whole idea of compassion is based on a keen awareness of the interdependence of all living beings.” It is when we face serious medical situations that we realize just how dependent we are on those who care for us, and it is when our family members are seriously ill or injured that we realize how dependent they are upon us. At these times, our concentration and concerns are not on our day-to-day work but on working to restore those we love to health.

This proposed legislation, if passed, would provide up to eight weeks of unpaid job-protected leave for an employee to provide care or support to a seriously ill or injured family member. I would like to emphasize that the leave would have to be taken in one-week increments; an employee could take up to eight weeks per year per specified family member.

A family member for whom an employee could request unpaid time off to care for could include: the employee's spouse; a parent, step-parent or foster parent of the employee or the employee's spouse; a child, step-child or foster child of the employee or the employee's spouse; a grandparent, a step-grandparent, a grandchild or step-grandchild of the employee or the employee's spouse; the spouse of a child of the employee; the employee's brother or sister; or a relative of the employee who is dependent on the employee for care or assistance.

And importantly for many in our province, it could be taken to care for family members who live in other provinces or even countries. We know that many Ontarians were born outside of Canada—in the greater Toronto area, that percentage is about half—and so the importance of having job-protected time to take care of family members who are seriously ill or injured is all the more important when we must travel and distance separates us from those we care about. As I had the opportunity to mention previously in this House, I know this from my own experience. I learned first-hand just how hard it can be to juggle work and family responsibilities when I worked in the private sector and my father became ill in Italy. All of the challenges and the stresses that we face when our loved ones are near us are compounded when we must travel long distances to help them.

But even when our family is near to us, having the time off is still important for us and for those we care for. My mother, who is 82 years old, lives with my family, and again, through my personal experiences, I can understand and sympathize with those who struggle to find the time for seriously ill or injured loved ones.

When we and those we love face these very difficult situations, the last thing we need is to fear being left unemployed because we need time away from work. Working Ontarians should not have to choose between their jobs and helping seriously ill or injured family members, and that is why the McGuinty government promised to introduce this bill. That is why we have fulfilled that promise and taken this action for the working people of our province.

Another goal of our government, which I'm sure we all share, is to make Ontario the healthiest place in North

America, both to grow up and grow old. We all know that across Canada we have an aging population, and it is clear that this puts pressure on our health care system. So when the opportunity is there to help seniors facing a serious medical condition stay in their homes, where the financial cost to society is lower, we believe that making that happen makes sense for everyone. We can and should recognize the vital role family members play in health care and make sure that they can play this role without fear of job loss.

As both the Minister of Health and the Minister of Labour have said, our proposed family caregiver leave would support our government's seniors' strategy. This strategy recognizes that providing good care at home allows our older Ontarians to remain where they want to be, while at the same time relieving the stress on our hospitals and long-term-care system. This is an important step forward, but to take this step family caregivers have to be able to be there, and so this proposed leave would help ensure that time to care.

As parliamentary assistant to the Ministry of Labour, I am also aware that our province faces a skills shortage. Whether it is the high-tech or construction industry, skilled workers are one of the important keys to a prosperous future for Ontario. Without the right skilled employees to do the job, the job will be done elsewhere, out of province. Keeping these skilled workers when they encounter the same family health crises we all face is a matter, then, of keeping our economy secure. So it would make economic sense to provide this caregiver leave rather than see skilled workers leave their employers.

For those who have questions whether this proposed leave could be taken advantage of, the bill provides reasonable protections for employers. First, for an employee to be entitled to the leave, a physician would have to issue a certificate stating that the family member has a serious medical condition. This note would have to be provided to an employer upon request. Secondly, this proposed leave would be unpaid. We have asked our federal counterparts to make those who take this leave eligible for employment insurance benefits and are awaiting a response. So, if passed, the leave would have reasonable controls in place to balance the interests of all parties. All Ontarians, whether workers or employers, can, in a heartbeat, face a situation in which a family member becomes seriously ill or injured. Illness and injury, Mr. Speaker, do not discriminate.

0910

We share a common bond, both as family members and as human beings vulnerable to sickness or injury, and it is the most vulnerable among us who would benefit most from this bill. We know that those who financially have the least have the least capacity and ability to use resources when seriously ill or injured. For those for whom normal, everyday life is a struggle, how much more is it true when they face the additional burden of caring for family members dealing with serious health issues? It is these caregivers who may also have the greatest fear of job loss; it is these employees who may

have the least, in terms of benefit provisions, that this bill would assist or protect. And so, again, our bill, if passed, would help the most vulnerable among us to protect those they love who are struggling with sickness or injury.

A working mother should not have to hesitate to take time away from her seriously ill or injured child or husband because she fears losing her income. A single parent should not have to choose between their employment and being there for an elderly father or mother who has suffered a stroke or a broken hip.

I know as well, from the experience of my constituents, of the struggle of those who immigrate to this country, of those who are dealing with learning a new language; those who may face job barriers and who are making an adjustment to a new culture. For these individuals, their job may be the one security, the one anchor of hope in a life surrounded by many challenges. This proposed job-protected leave for family caregivers would help immigrants not only during their period of adjustment to a new country and province, but also if and when a loved one abroad is ill or injured.

There is another group, of course, to whom an unequal share of the responsibility of caregiving has historically fallen, and that is women—and women who have the least are the most vulnerable. I do not believe that any in this House would want a mother to worry about providing for her child who is seriously ill or injured because she fears she will lose all or a significant part of that family's livelihood.

Certainly women, or any employee who is working part-time or on contract, can also be among those who are most vulnerable and who may have the greatest fear of losing their job when they need to take time off when family health crises occur. So the bill would make all employees who are covered by the Ontario Employment Standards Act eligible for this proposed job-protected family caregiver leave. Whether they are full-time, part-time or on contract, Ontario workers covered by the ESA would be eligible for this leave. I believe that's only fair and that is only just.

The one thing Ontarians need the most when it comes to caring for seriously ill or injured family members is the time to be with their loved ones. This proposed legislation is part of the McGuinty government's commitment to ensure that families across Ontario have the support they need when they need it the most.

Our proposed family caregiver leave is a matter of compassion and caring for those who provide care to their loved ones. I believe it is simply the right thing to do for Ontario families and residents.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** Just a few comments on the bill, the Family Caregiver Leave Act; I'll be speaking to it in a few minutes anyhow. But basically, I think the bill is lacking clear definition. I think it needs to be taken back and rewritten so that the questions are answered; so that we can actually have a good debate on this bill.

I thank the speaker for her time, but basically, the minister's staff has yet to provide that there is actually a

need for this legislation. We already have family medical leave and personal emergency leave. I think those pretty much handle what is needed today.

Also of note: This act doesn't really help small businesses. In fact, it might actually hurt small businesses: those with 10 or less employees who will find it hard to replace the staff that do leave due to issues with the family. You find, if it's a very specialized person working for you, it's hard to replace them, let alone to train and staff.

The other part: I think the comment on this bill is that the government today needs to start focusing more on our economic situation. We're heading toward disaster in this province. Our deficit is at \$16 billion and heading toward \$30 billion, and we have yet to see an act or bill come out—let alone a response to the Drummond report—to deal with these issues. I would really appreciate the government actually getting to work. Go to work on the issues that are at hand, and that's getting jobs back to this province and getting regulations in place; setting up good tax structures; going through with their promise to lower corporate tax rates; and getting Ontario back to business so that we can start to pay off our debt and get jobs for the future.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Ms. Cindy Forster:** While we support the intent of the bill, I think that eligibility and enforcement are going to be a problem. The government is already suggesting that the ESA budget be cut by \$6 million, and we know that enforcement is an issue with legislation that's currently in place many times here in the province.

Section 49.3(5), I think, is problematic in the bill as well, because it requires people to actually take a full week of leave off as opposed to individual days. In many cases, these may be lower-paid workers trying to access these leaves of absence for serious illness in their family. I think that if they were able to take individual days and perhaps share that time off with family members, it might assist more workers here in the province.

I'll give an example of the kind of enforcement and eligibility that I've dealt with over the years: under the Election Act, where people are able to take three hours off or four hours off to vote in a municipal, federal or provincial election. Even in unionized settings, workers who are unionized have difficulty getting the employer to give them that time off. Clearly, in non-unionized settings many never get time off to vote, even though there's legislation around that.

So I think that the enforcement and monitoring piece will be the big issue. The second piece will be the kind of prescriptive requirement to take no less than a week off at a time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I certainly appreciated the remarks made by my colleague the member from York South-Weston on Bill 30, the Family Caregiver Leave Act.

I think all of us in this House, over our lives, often are faced with situations where a family member or another loved one, injured family members—indeed, to provide care if they are indeed seriously ill or injured. And an opportunity, of course, to be with family members—what is always an extremely difficult time, when one is dealing with these kinds of situations. All of us, I think, agree in this House that family caregiver leave is a matter of compassion and the right thing to do for Ontario families.

Inevitably, this bill will make its way to committee: an opportunity to solicit opinions from right across every sector of the province of Ontario, to join us here during the committee process. One of the great advantages, of course, of a minority government will be an opportunity to work with our good friends in the official opposition and, indeed, the third party in order to build the Ontario consensus on a key issue that we want to be discussed here.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** My good friend the House leader, I know, wants to build that kind of consensus on this kind of bill, Bill 30.

I also note that in York South-Weston, at the Weston Golf and Country Club, was the first PGA victory for Arnold Palmer, in the 1955 Canadian Open in York South-Weston. For those of us who are interested in golf trivia, that's a very important historical fact from York South-Weston.

0920

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Mr. Steve Clark:** I want to respond to the address from the member for York South-Weston, but I also want to say how impressed I was with the member for Peterborough. He's a virtual cornucopia of golf trivia. So I want to thank him for that little snippet of golf trivia about the member opposite's riding.

I want to take this opportunity to try to work into my comments a meeting that I just had in my office with people from Epilepsy Ontario. I want to recognize in the west members' gallery a couple of people that I met with: Pamela Murray, the executive director of Epilepsy Ottawa-Carleton; I also want to introduce Susan Harrison, the executive director of Epilepsy and Seizure Disorder Resource Centre in Kingston, who is actually from my riding of Leeds-Grenville. I want to welcome them to Queen's Park. Also, I met with Peter Andrews, and we had a great meeting talking about some of the issues that they are bringing forward today.

I did have an opportunity to talk to them just briefly, and I appreciate their patience with me running off to my House duty this morning. Certainly they are strongly recommending today that MPPs support and urge the adoption of the Ontario epilepsy strategy. We talked about some of the issues around getting care; the fact that many people who are affected with epilepsy take sometimes over a year, sometimes multiple years, depending on where they live, to get access; and as well, some of

the barriers that they have receiving drugs and also for employment issues around ODSP.

They were surprised when I mentioned that I was running off to talk about Bill 30 because, given some of the issues with employment, you'd think that the government would take time and speak to stakeholders. I know the member for Lanark-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington mentioned that in his address.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for York South-Weston has two minutes to respond.

**Mrs. Laura Albanese:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to also thank all the members that have taken the time to comment on the bill: the member for Elgin-Middlesex-London, the members for Welland, from Peterborough and Leeds-Grenville.

I would like to specify that there is a gap in the current leaves of absence under the ESA. The ESA doesn't currently provide a long-term unpaid protected leave for employees who want to care for a family member with a serious medical condition where there is no imminent death risk. So the family medical leave is an unpaid job-protected leave for a family member that has a serious medical condition with a significant risk of death within a period of 26 weeks.

Also, the personal emergency leave provides short-term unpaid protection for 10 days per calendar year for a broad list of emergencies and illnesses. So there is a difference with the current bill that we are proposing.

As far as businesses are concerned, I also want to point out that only employees whose employer regularly employs 50 or more employees are eligible to take the personal emergency leave.

The government does recognize that some smaller operations may have some challenges in providing this proposed leave, but what I think is really important is that employers care about creating a more positive, a more loyal, a more protective workplace. By having something like this in place, I think it will go a long way in sending that message. The proposed bill is also supported by many organizations in the sector.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** I'm glad to have a few words on Bill 30, the Family Caregiver Leave Act.

"The bill amends the Employment Standards Act, 2000.

"Section 49.3, which creates family caregiver leave, is added to the act. Under section 49.3, an employee is entitled to a leave of absence without pay to provide care or support to a family member who has a serious medical condition. An employee may take up to eight weeks per calendar year with respect to each family member described in the section or prescribed by regulation. Entitlement to family caregiver leave is in addition to any entitlement to family medical leave under section 49.1 and personal emergency leave under section 50."

I just wanted to review that, because it's been a few days since I've listened to the debate.

My first point is: Is there really a need for this bill at this point in time? I haven't received any letters, any emails or any indication that anybody really wants this bill to be at this time. Usually, I get quite a few emails. I'm sure many of our colleagues here will hear from their constituents and stakeholders when there is actually a bill up for discussion, giving their points. I'll make two references here: I think I get about, I don't know, 100 emails a day just on this wind energy from MPP Lisa Thompson, her motion—

**Interjection:** Only 100?

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** Per day—her private member's motion which calls for the moratorium on further Industrial wind turbine development until third party health and environmental studies have been completed. So, I know this is an issue and I'm hearing every day that people support this motion. I hope in the House later on, when we debate, that we'll pass this motion. But as I'm saying, they are letting me know, and with the caregiver leave I have yet to hear anybody. Maybe when I get back to my office today I'll have a few.

Another point here that I know is big out there—and I know it's a huge issue because I'm getting lots of emails, and more now. I don't know if you guys are getting them, on the value for money, the horse racing issues that are out there. You know, that's an urgent problem that needs to be debated, and I hope the government will bring that up for debate in the House.

**Interjection:** It could help us out.

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** Well, exactly. I mean, I'm hearing here that the government, at the end of the day, has taken in over \$1 billion that they can spend on health care and education, and with one fell swoop of the pen they're going to break an agreement that's revenue-sharing and that \$1 billion is going to disappear. I don't know where they're going to get that money to replace their costs in health care and education.

But I mean, these are just various issues that actually come across my desk. Again, as I've made earlier, I have yet to hear a support or a yea or nay on the caregiver leave act. And I'm just wondering.

I mean, I think the government works under perception. They want to give us the perception they're actually doing something when—

**Interjection:**

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** Actually, yeah. They're ignoring the economy, the jobs; things that we need to be dealing with. They go on the perception that they're doing something, so they'll say they're discussing, they're passing these laws. "It's something that is good for Ontario; working together"—their usual spin.

But they also tried perception on other issues, like Ornge. They say Ornge is under control; there are no problems; they've replaced the board of directors and everything is hunky-dory, but really, in the perception, Ornge has been a total disgrace to our province. I think Mr. Smitherman, when he wrote the legislation, made huge errors and the government has not picked up on them over the seven or eight years.

**Interjection: eHealth.**

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** eHealth's another one.

Perception on our deficit: "No problem. We're actually ahead." This year, in their economic statement, they said they're ahead of projections on the deficit: It's \$16 billion instead of \$16.5 billion. The debt: "No problems." But you look at the Drummond report, and we're headed to a \$30-billion deficit in four years and \$400 billion in debt. You try to run this government when you're \$400 billion in debt—you think the services are suffering today, you wait. In four years' time, what are services really going to be like?

So we need the government to stop living in the world of perception and just giving people—like, we're working on giving this caregiver act. We need them to start working on some hardcore issues.

The other thing I've noticed in reading about this: This is the sixth new leave of absence introduced in the past seven years. Six in seven years. What have they done for job creation? What have they done for fixing the tax structure in the last seven years? I haven't seen it. I think, before I personally dissect this part of the bill, this bill itself is sloppy. There are too many open-ended questions and not enough definitions. I think it should be pulled back and rewritten. I think it's a sloppy, sloppy bill. But I'll dissect parts of the bill, and parts of other bills—personal emergency leave, declared emergency leave, family medical leave, reservist leave, organ donor leave.

**0930**

Personal emergency leave, just to review that one: There's actually a cut-off there for small businesses. If it's 50 or more employees, this leave affects them. There's got to be a reason why there is a cut-off for small businesses. I think it's pretty obvious that businesses with few employees find it harder to replace staff who leave. While I support the personal emergency leave, I'm glad there is a cut-off there for small businesses. It has a definition of "emergency," and it's limited to 10 days. I think any business can get by with an employee leaving for 10 days on short notice. I think that's fair. I think that was a good idea and it's a good leave.

For family medical leave, eight weeks are allowed, which is fine. I mean, we do get emergencies. There's a clear definition of why you can leave. Sadly, it's because someone will pass away within 26 weeks. We understand that; we're a compassionate province and a compassionate country, and we understand that in your lifetime when those stresses occur, it's good to give support, to go and support your family member. The other benefit of this is that the federal government has actually said that they would support it for six weeks of EI insurance, to help fund the person. So they're taking a leave from work, and instead of having the hardship of worrying about paying the mortgage or the car payments or their high energy costs, they are able to collect some unemployment insurance and they can focus on their family member, or whoever, to take care of them. It is only for a spouse, parent, child or family member, and that makes sense.

Now, in this bill they talk about how a person can take a leave because they have a "serious medical condition." That term is not defined. How can employers and employees manage this kind of leave if the definition has not been set? Every other leave has a definition of how you can take that leave. I looked up the definition of "serious health condition." One definition: "'Serious health condition' entitling an employee to ... leave means an illness, injury, impairment, or physical or mental condition that involves either (1) in-patient care or (2) continuing treatment by a health care provider."

The definition of "in-patient care" is relatively straightforward. "'In-patient care' means an overnight stay in a hospital, hospice, or residential medical care facility, including any period of incapacity or any subsequent treatment in connection with such in-patient care. The term 'incapacity' for the purposes of this definition means inability to work, attend school or perform other regular daily activities due to the serious health condition, its treatment, or recovery from it."

The definition of "continuing treatment" encompasses numerous different scenarios which are discussed in detail in the regulations that I was talking about; this comes from the United States.

A serious health condition involving continuing treatment by a health care provider includes the following—now, this is a different definition:

"'Incapacity and treatment' requires a period of incapacity of more than three consecutive, full calendar days, and any subsequent treatment or period of incapacity relating to the same condition, that also involves:

"(a) Treatment two or more times within 30 days of the first day of incapacity, unless extenuating circumstances exist, by a health care provider, by a nurse under the direct supervision of a health care provider, or by a provider of health care services under orders of, or on referral by, a health care provider; or

"(b) Treatment by a health care provider on at least one occasion, which results in a regimen of continuing treatment under the supervision of the health care provider.

"The two treatments referred to in (a) above and the initial treatment referred to in (b) above must be in-person. The first (or only) in-person treatment visit must take place within seven days of the first day of incapacity.

"In-person treatment or the regimen of continuing treatment may take place after the period of incapacity has ended and the employee has returned to work. Therefore, leave that may not have qualified" for the leave-of-absence leave "at the time it was taken may later meet the requirements" of the leave and need to be retroactively designated as such. Confusing.

Where are the definitions in that? It's leading to problems in this area in the States.

What is a "serious health condition"? An "illness, injury, impairment or any physical or mental condition that involves either (1) in-patient [medical] care or (2) continuing treatment by a health care provider." Is that emphysema, a ruptured appendix, asthma, heart attacks, a

bad back, arthritis, cancer, stroke, spinal injuries, nervous disorders, any serious injury caused by an accident on or off the job, emotional distress, migraine headaches?

What is the definition going to be? I think if you have this bill and you don't have the definition set out, I think that's truly unfair to employers—and employees, those wanting to take the leave.

Now, I'm going to talk about consultations with stakeholders. I just wonder if the government has taken the time to actually talk to small businesses. Has there been an impact analysis on how this will affect them in running their businesses? This government here does have a habit of being indifferent to how legislation affects the job creators in communities, especially in small-town areas like St. Thomas, and I've seen it first-hand at my pharmacy.

Our party here has campaigned on a promise to bring about a small business bill of rights, and I fully agree with it. The main point was to consult with businesses before any new legislation or regulation is tabled, so there's the fact that it will be known how a regulation or legislation will affect a small business. We, as a party, do recognize that small businesses are the engine of growth and the job creators.

This bill here has no exemption for small business and family medical leave—whereas family medical leave has a cut-off of 50 employees. I'll just take this to a personal level. Back at Yurek Pharmacy, we're currently at 60 employees, so we're good. We have enough coverage now. We've grown our business—not with the help of the government; we did it on our own—and we're now over 60. But back about 10 years ago, we had about 12 employees. I can tell you now that if a pharmacist left my business out of the blue to go on caregiver leave, that would have devastated my business. Number one, a pharmacist is a highly skilled worker. They can't just be replaced by anybody in the business. Number two, there is a shortage of pharmacists, especially in rural—not in Toronto; Toronto has a lot of pharmacists. But if you go to rural communities up north or down south, it's hard to find a pharmacist to come in to work, especially in small cities like St. Thomas or Aylmer or Port Stanley. To actually find a pharmacist overnight would be quite hard. I tell you, 10 years ago we ran into a position where we actually ran out of pharmacists. Being the employer, I was working around the clock every day, my brother and I, and it was tough.

The third part about it is, if this pharmacist left and I was able to find a pharmacist to bring in—they're called locums. They don't work for me; they work for themselves. But their rates are one and a half times higher than what we pay employees. It's highly expensive to bring these people in to work for us and to have them trained to how our operations work. That would have been a high cost to our business 10 years ago. It would be a high cost now, but I think we would be able to manage it with the higher staffing that we do have.

So I just wonder if the government actually thought about how, economically, this could be devastating to small, family-run, independent businesses out there.

I think the government is so removed and focused on multinational corporations. Not every business out there is a big multinational company. I think the larger employers out there, the factories that we have and the industrial sector—their union agreements probably already have a caregiver leave in their contract. I would bet money that the majority of them already do have it. So really, is this bill going to affect them or be any benefit to them? As I said before, I think the government should be focusing on our economy.

Again, the structure and the operations: Employers are going to need to be more flexible with their hiring. It's not going to be easy just to pick someone and train them for one specific job. They're going to have to do some cross-training, and maybe that's going to inhibit people being hired, because they don't have the skills to be able to work more than one particular skill set in a business. So you might actually be hurting jobs. I know this is a stretch, but you might actually be hurting jobs with this caregiver act.

Again, the employer has to continue to pay benefits, has to bring in a replacement and has to pay their salaries. In this day and age, when costs to businesses are high, for those that are running borderline, this might actually put small businesses out of business. The Auditor General's report states that electricity bills will rise 46% over the next five years. I think that cost alone is going to be hard enough on businesses, let alone pulling away staff.

The questions that they ask—like, how long do you hire? I mean, person can take a week at a time, up to eight weeks. Do you hire for a week? Do you hire for eight weeks? And then if someone comes back in three weeks, you've got double, and you've got to pay them out.

**0940**

I think they need to sit down and review this bill and actually call up some small business owners. I'll give them a list, and they can call them up, and they'll get it first-hand. They'll get an honest opinion from the business owners, because they don't like government—either way, opposition or the sitting government—being involved in their businesses. They'll tell you up front how bills like this would affect their businesses.

I also have a concern in the agricultural sector. With this type of bill, especially during the spring planting and the fall harvesting, if an employee leaves, there's the fact that the farmer has to go and find someone to replace them. In rural Ontario, I don't know if there are really that many out there to pull in to help with the harvest, let alone for them to pay—if it's a bad harvest year and their yield is down and yet they still have to hire someone to come in, that might actually have a higher cost.

I also want to talk about the financial crunch that this bill could have on people. The fact that the government has only expressed an intention to press the federal government to offer employment insurance benefits—so they put forward this bill for us to pass, and they're going to expect people to leave work, being compassionate, but

they're not going to have any employment insurance to cover them in paying their mortgage or paying for food. So I think the right thing to do would be for this government to actually talk to the federal government and get this agreement in place before the act is passed. I think that's a smart thing to do; it's actually planning ahead. Again, I always go back to the fact that the government needs to start planning for this \$30-billion deficit we're headed for and start dealing with the problems at hand. The federal government is working hard to balance its budget and may not be able to afford extra payments into this caregiver act; they might actually just deny it. So you've done this act—good for you—but no one can really take advantage of it, because there's no money for them to live their lives.

The government, as I said, likes to say everything is under control; I have, from the Auditor General's report, some words that kind of prove they're not: "It is important to note that while the government has presented a plan to eliminate the annual deficit by 2017-18, no clear strategy or forecast has been articulated for paying down its existing and future debt."

I take that to heart, because we have the Drummond report sitting on someone's desk in the government, and that's a plan to get the deficit down. I'm sure they can come up with a plan, and waiting until April, when they give out the budget—we'd rather have that plan sooner than later so we can start working towards being fiscally responsible in this province.

Another thing is, the Minister of Health has talked about increasing home care coverage for people, and I think that's great. I have worked with a lot of home care workers quite a bit—I'm now a politician, and I guess I'm not working with too many right now—and I think the nurses and the physios who visit are hard-working people, and it gives people a sense of comfort in their home. If we have money going in to develop this home care system, maybe we don't need to rush into this caregiver leave act, because there is someone there who is going to be taking care of your family member while you work. I know that's a tough thing to say, but it's tougher times. We want to focus on supporting our small businesses and supporting family members, and we can't have everything. I think if we're putting money into home care and having the visitations and having someone there with your loved one while you're able to still work—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** As a review; I mean, as a small business owner—you just took me right out of my talk.

*Interjections.*

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** I'll take a rest. I could start talking about golf, but I won't.

So, just to review, we need to define medical illness, we need to protect small businesses, and we need to get the federal government on board with covering the leave.

Thanks for your time, and I appreciate your comments.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Comments and questions? The member for Parkdale—High Park.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, and might I say it's good to see you back in the chair again.

I'm pleased to respond to our friend from the Progressive Conservative honourable opposition. Certainly, their concern for small business is laudable; we don't see much of that concern reflected on the government side of the House these days. In fact, there was a very problematic comment made by the finance minister just yesterday in question period, seeming to say that the New Democratic Party was not on the side of small business. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, we had the lowest small business tax rate as part of our party platform of all the parties. Government simply assumed our platform, which we're thankful for, but it's hardly their innovation.

We're very sensitive about small business. It creates 90% of the jobs in Ontario, and it's been particularly hard-pressed by this government; I look forward to talking about how hard-pressed in my minutes coming up.

I also listened to his concerns about the actual efficacy of this bill, which clearly is not going to be very efficient at all in helping those who want to spend time with their loved ones, since who can afford in Ontario, particularly this Ontario, the Ontario of the McGuinty Liberals, to take eight weeks off of work without pay? You show me that person and I'll show you a person that probably could take it off before this bill was even introduced.

So again, the problem is not for most businesses and most people taking time off to look after a loved one who's in distress; most employers that I've talked to have some way of doing that. The problem is the pay when you do it, and this bill does not address that whatsoever.

Like all the feel-good bills that this government brings forward that go an inch when you need a thousand miles, we will probably support it, only to see it go to committee so we can make valuable amendments, which this bill desperately needs. But the idea that the federal government is going to come and save their bacon on this one, Madam Speaker, is a joke. One would think they would have consulted first and acted later.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments or questions?

**Mrs. Laura Albanese:** A few points that I would like to make: First of all, in regard to how a serious medical condition can be defined in the proposed bill, it would leave it up to the doctors; it leaves to them the discretion to determine on a case-by-case basis whether an individual has a serious medical condition. The term is hard to define in legislation because, similarly to family medical leave, it would give the doctors the discretion to determine on a case-by-case basis whether an individual has a serious medical condition. So it may not be practical to define this term.

For who can afford to take the eight weeks off, I would like to stress that it can be taken in increments of one week. I would also like to say that my experience has been that some constituents that find themselves in this situation end up losing their job, whether they can afford

it or not, because they're trying to take care of the person in the family that is seriously ill. At least this bill would prevent that. At least their job would have to be kept.

Now, we all know that a lot rests upon the relationship between the employer and the employee. As far as the supports for small businesses, one thing I would like to say is that it does try to really prevent potential abuse by employees requiring the medical certificates and putting in place other requirements as well.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Mr. John O'Toole:** I want to compliment the member from Elgin–Middlesex–London. He spoke in a very informed way and I think helped members of the Legislature understand what he calls some of the sloppy sections of the drafting of the bill. I think I should reinforce the fact that he is a health care provider; he's a professionally trained pharmacist, and spoke with great authority in terms of some of the medical glitches as well as the impact on small business. I like the way he wrapped it into a context of where Ontario is today. In fact, he said quite clearly—and I'm sure our leader would say the same thing—that we're all for compassion and honesty and integrity and transparency with the people of Ontario.

But if you look at this particular bill, Bill 30, you find out that there's this lack of clarity. It's similar, as he mentioned, to—some of this has parallels to Ornge, the air ambulance system in Ontario. It's a travesty when you look at it examined. Every day for the last three or four weeks, the Minister of Health has failed to admit that she completely messed up the file and put Ontarians at risk.

0950

Now, the issue with this thing is, as the member from the NDP caucus said, who can take eight weeks off without pay? Really, it's as simple as that. They're saying people can take eight weeks off—and by the way, they're going to blame Stephen Harper for not giving them employment insurance. It's a travesty, a sort of a shell game here for the people of Ontario.

We're for compassion. The most compassionate thing you could do is provide an economy for jobs for young people. That would be a good start. We have 600,000 families in Ontario out of work. They can't afford to heat their homes.

What they've done to seniors, increasing—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. Further comments and questions?

**Mr. John Vanthof:** It's my pleasure to comment on some of the other speakers today—especially Elgin–Middlesex–London? Cool, I remembered that.

A bill like this is like voting against motherhood and apple pie, and that's kind of the way it's written. It's almost like it's written in a way that, yes, you can't criticize it because it's like criticizing motherhood and apple pie, but that's part of the problem. It's almost like it's made to divide us on something that we should be working together on.

There will be other issues coming in the House later on where they take issues that we should have serious discussions on, but they're making it “either you're with us or you're against us,” and that's a big problem. And the government side is looking—yes, it's the guys on this side, but a lot of times it's the government side doing the “you're with us or you're against us.” They're making things complicated for both employees and employers.

If you're a small employer—I'm under 15. I have employees, and I have under 15, so do I qualify? Do my employees qualify under that? Can they qualify? It's things like that. We have to be much more clear. And, yes, all motherhood and apple pie is great, but we've got to be a lot more clear on who qualifies. I know my employees; if they had to take a lot of time off, they couldn't afford it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Thank you. The member for Elgin–Middlesex–London has two minutes to respond.

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** I want to thank the comments from the members from Parkdale–High Park—that's right, these seating arrangements work well for me—the member from York South–Weston, thank you; Durham, thank you; and Timiskaming–Cochrane—never been there. It's pretty up north though, I imagine.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** You're cordially invited.

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** Well, some day I'm going to come up there.

Thank you and thank you for your comments. For the record, I do love my mom.

**Interjection:** Do you like apple pie?

**Mr. Jeff Yurek:** I love apple pie. I'm not a fan of baseball, though, but that's another topic.

I've checked with my EA, and I still have yet to receive any emails, so I don't know if people at home are watching or what have you, but if you are watching and you have an opinion on this act, please let me know because they'll help me formulate my decision on this bill.

But I think the bill is too broad. It needs to be more clear, more defined, and we need to deal with the small business aspect. This bill is coming out—and maybe I'm just taking it a little too personal, the fact that you actually need a bill because businesses are all bad and that.

I have operated my business; my dad started in 1963, and I've been at it for 16 years now with my brother. We've had to deal with these issues before in our business. It's just basically sitting down and talking with our employee. We've given people time off, the time they need, and it wasn't set like, “You're off for this week.” It worked for both of us. We said, “We understand your position, but do you understand our position and the fact that you're a key member of our team and you can't fill in the time?” The way it usually works out is they'll get some of the week off but they'll come in and work a couple hours on the night shift. It's working together, and I don't know if the government needs to set laws to make people work together. I think small business owners out

there are compassionate and they are working with people if these instances do come up.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** It's always an honour to rise in this place and stand for the people of Ontario, many of whom do not feel they have a voice in this place. So it's always, I think, incumbent upon us to try to give them that voice.

Let's look at the backdrop behind this bill in the province of Ontario. The backdrop behind this bill is a province that is experiencing record poverty levels, unprecedented homelessness and waits for affordable housing. The backdrop to this bill is a record number of bankruptcies in small business. The background behind this bill is joblessness and people who are in very precarious employment, good manufacturing jobs lost for precarious part-time contract labour, minimum wage labour. That's the backdrop behind here.

By the way, the health care backdrop behind this bill is waiting lists, a half a million Ontarians without a family doctor, nurses being laid off and our seniors—seniors who might be the ones who are in some ways recipients of the concern of this bill—sitting in emergency rooms in hospitals when they should be in long-term care or be sent home but they don't have home care, but there aren't long-term-care beds waiting for them. So that's the backdrop.

Now, against that myriad of problems, that horrendous scene I've just described, which, for someone who was born in Toronto, raised in Ontario, we have never seen before—it's never been this bad in my lifetime. It was this bad in my father's lifetime—it was called the 1930s—but it's not been this bad in my lifetime.

Against that backdrop, we have this little bill. It's a very little bill. It's a minuscule bill. It's a bill that gives people what they probably, in most cases, already have, which is time off from work to look after somebody who is extremely ill or dying or dead. That's what this bill gives. It doesn't pay them. It doesn't give them any money for doing it. It doesn't provide home care. It doesn't provide long-term care. It doesn't provide any of the supports medically that they need; for example, equipment or pharmaceuticals or anything else that might be weighing down the finances of that family. No, all it does is give them time off work so that they won't be fired.

Now, Madam Speaker, this is cynical. I would sort of second the motherhood and apple pie, but I would say it's pretty cynical. It's not really motherhood; it's kind of guest parenting. And it's not really apple pie; it's some synthetic variation of the same. I mean, this is a cynical bill. This is a little bill that gives to someone dying of thirst a teaspoon of water and then expects them to survive a little bit longer. That's this bill.

But, of course, it's a teaspoon of water, isn't it, Madam Speaker? So we can't vote against it. But, boy oh boy, can we say some things about it, which is what I intend to do.

Okay. You know what they could have done? Let me tell you about another jurisdiction in the world, Madam Speaker, where, if you have someone at home who has a disability and needs ongoing help or, for example, Alzheimer's—any of the problems that might ask for somebody to come home, and some relative might want to take care of this individual full-time. In Sweden, do you know what they do? In Sweden, if you have a relative who needs your help full-time at home, the Swedish government will send you on a course so you know how to look after that person; get you involved in a union, so you're a union employee; and then pay you a full-time salary to go home and look after them.

Now, that's not a teaspoon of water. That's actually enough water to bathe in and have some left over to cook and never go thirsty again. That's dramatic. The distance from that kind of reality to this kind of reality is an ocean's worth, quite frankly. It is an ocean's worth, to be literal about it. But surely we can do a little bit better than this.

#### 1000

By the way, to again paint a picture of the backdrop, Ontario is a province where Workers' Action has told us that about 50% of the employers that they surveyed weren't even matching the labour code such as it is. That is to say that these employers weren't paying minimum wage—and by the way, I hear these complaints in my constituency office all the time—but the employees were frightened to complain about it because they'd be fired.

This is a province where migrant workers are killed. By the way, did their relatives get compassionate leave to come up and be with them? Did they get anything? What's happening with that case? What's happening with migrant workers and their lack of any kind of labour oversight?

But for the rest of Ontario, let's look at those employees who don't even get their regular vacation time pay. There's lots of them, and they're frightened to complain. Why? Because they might be fired.

Here is a province where only one in every 100 employers ever gets a visit from somebody who's going to enforce labour standards—ever—one in 100. I'm not even talking about the employers—and we all know about them in our immigrant communities—that fly right under the radar, that aren't even picked up by the Workers' Action survey. These people are simply employing illegals, paying them illegal amounts, subjecting them to all sorts of abuse—that goes on here too, and we don't do nearly enough about it.

We have the Ontario Federation of Labour in the building today about other matters, but they can tell you that one of their campaigns, "Kill a worker, go to jail," has been met with deaf ears from this government. So workers have been killed in this province and nobody has gone to jail—nobody has gone to jail. Why were they killed? Lack of safety, lack of safety enforcement—we know that our construction sites are dangerous places. Again, where is this government on that file?

So in light of the labour backdrop, this is a cynical little piece of legislation; again, the teaspoon of water

when the patient is dying of thirst. This is a cynical piece of legislation in light of the reality of provincial life, of the life of the average Ontarian.

I don't know anybody, including the members of this chamber, many of whom could afford to take eight weeks off without pay—now, the member across said, when I said that the first time in my two-minute hit, “Well, they don't have to take eight weeks.” That's nice. What if you want to take it; what if you have to take eight weeks? Ontarians can't afford to take eight weeks off without pay. How out of touch can this government be?

We know that most Ontarians are a paycheck or two away from being impoverished themselves. We know that the record levels of debt in this province are unprecedented. I couldn't afford to take two months off without pay. Can I imagine how someone of middle income or lower could take two months off without pay? Maybe I could take a week. Come on.

Against the great needs of those with great health needs, this bill is sad. It's sad; truly, it's sad. Against the huge problem in our labour force with actually enforcing any kind of employment standards whatsoever, this bill is sad. It's sad.

I don't know anybody—I actually don't know anybody of my friends and family who could afford to take advantage of this bill. Now, if I don't know that, who does? In a large company with a union, this bill is irrelevant because they probably, in many instances, already have this. For most compassionate leave, even small business employers—if someone is deathly ill, most small employers will make do. I know I've had two in my family. I used to be a small employer, a small business person; my son is a small business person. Would they work around something like this? Absolutely; they would do it already. They would do it already. This bill is not going to—I mean, how many people?

Do you know what would be really, really interesting? What I challenge this government to do—I challenge them to do something that they rarely do around these kinds of bills—is to actually do a follow-up study and to actually report back to this House—because I assume this bill will pass, hopefully with some necessary amendments—about how many people have actually taken advantage of this bill after it has been in place for a couple of years.

Now, I suppose the government has the out that they may not be in place in a couple of years, so there's always that. But to be a little less cynical than they are, let's assume they are still in place; let's assume this bill does pass. Let's ask them, “Show me the numbers.” Show me the numbers of people that actually get any kind of benefit out of this tiny, little bill, a teaspoon of water when the patient is dying of thirst. Show me the numbers. I would love, love, love to see them. It's interesting.

Now, the member, of course, as they always are wont to do in the loyal opposition, talked about the impacts on small business. The members opposite quite rightly pointed out that this bill exempts some small business

owners. But let me tell you that small business is also really hurting in this province, and unless this bill is very carefully administered and very carefully communicated, it's going to be hurt even further.

You know, I had some garage owners, Madam Speaker, come into my office the other day and talk about how much the new Drive Clean program is going to cost them in this province. The average independent garage owner—it's going to cost them between \$6,000 and \$20,400 a month. And they have to purchase their equipment from a sole source and, trust me, it sounds very suspicious, a sole source company. They've been told they have to do this by the government. They were given about two months' warning in January about this. So the government doesn't care about them, because this will drive some of them over the edge into bankruptcy as well.

This government didn't care about independent butchers. Remember that situation long ago? I had a couple of independent butchers go out of business in my riding because they were smoking their own sausages, and although the Toronto Board of Health had for years told them they were fine, this government said, “No, no, you're not fine. You have to spend \$200,000 to update your butcher shops.” Guess what? They're all out of business now, too. And of course, in that instance, talking about a health concern, who was responsible for the listeriosis scare? It wasn't small butchers. It was Maple Leaf Foods, a contributor to the Liberal Party.

So that's where this government sits, and let's make no bones about it: This government is not a friend to small business. It never has been. It probably never will be because they're not the ones who can afford a \$10,000 seat at a fundraiser. It's banks and insurance companies, let's face it, and developers, too—very good friends of developers.

So small business was not on their radar when the bill was developed either. And it'll be interesting again to track—but note, I'm challenging them to track too—how this bill, once implemented, actually impacts anybody in the community. I would say to my colleagues in the PC Party and also to those small businesses in my riding and across Ontario, though, I don't think you have much to worry about, quite frankly, because I honestly don't think that much is going to come of this bill whatsoever except public relations.

Public relations is something that this government tends to excel at, Madam Speaker, hence they're still across the aisle. Public relations bills like this and others that sound good, look good at first blush, accomplish extremely little but make a sound bite, are how they've been governing for the last eight years.

To go back to where I started at the beginning of this, that is what's led to the backdrop behind which this bill is invoked—the backdrop of loss of jobs, loss of manufacturing, delisting of essential health services, challenges to the health care system, unenforced labour standards, a terrible labour record and, again, no dollars in at the bottom to help people up; rather, huge corporate

tax giveaways at the top, hoping that that will trickle down.

Of course, we saw as well that this government is still—presumably, who knows? They voted against our bill that asked them to stop the next round of corporate tax cuts, but then they seem to be in favour of it. So, typically Liberal: yes-no-maybe is the answer—absolutely on the fence on that one. But it looks like, Madam Speaker, they're going to go ahead with even more corporate tax cuts, which will then—again—steal from the tax base, the revenue base that goes to afford any kind of health care, education or social services that we already have. So this is all behind this little cynical bill. This is all behind this little cynical bill.

You know, it makes one weary. It makes one feel a little old when you get up and you talk about the same things over and over again. For me, it's been six years without seeing much change. But I have to—you know, credit where credit's due: They're masters at this kind of bill, absolute masters at the kind of bill that purports to do something and does nothing; that looks good but doesn't benefit anyone. This is the latest of the Liberal offerings.

I should also add that the other backdrop behind this bill, of course, is the Ornge scandal, a scandal on which, of course, they're desperate to change the channel, because when \$25 million of taxpayers' money is missing from the health care file, when the OPP is probably knocking on the Premier's door or the Minister of Health's as we speak to find out what they knew and when they knew it, you'll want to change the channel. You don't want to have the focus on that—and the focus has been on that in this House ever since we came back, every single day. I suspect today won't be much different.

They want to change that channel. How better to do the changing of the channel than with, you know, as my friend from Timiskaming-Cochrane said, a motherhood-and-apple-pie bill that—eh, not a very good mother and a store-bought apple pie, but at least it sounds nice. It sounds nice; it purports to help somebody. Certainly not the people who are relying on an air ambulance service; not the people who relied on the eHealth card either; not the people—when I was first elected, \$35 million went out the back door to a cricket club. We've all forgotten that when we moved on from there to the scandal of eHealth, and moved on from the scandal of eHealth to the scandal of Ornge. But hopefully a little bill, a little cynical bill will, you know, get some media play and kind of—just maybe—people won't think about what's going on behind the bill.

So, Madam Speaker, I'm going to stop there, and I'm going to say, "Oh yeah, we'll probably vote for it." I mean, a teaspoon of water to a person dying of thirst is better than nothing. But it's cynical, it's shady and hopefully it'll go to committee where we will make some necessary amendments before we bring it back to this House. But at the end of the day, even with the necessary amendments I doubt that this bill will really help many. I

doubt it will really cost much, which of course is what they're also counting on as well, because if it doesn't help many, of course it won't cost much.

I also, of course, challenge them to rethink their whole approach to employers and start to think that, you know, 90% of jobs created are small business. Start to think about them a little bit, which is just to echo the words of my colleagues to the right here.

So: eight weeks, no pay, good luck. Nobody will take it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

*Second reading debate deemed adjourned.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** It being close to 10:15, this House stands recessed until 10:30.

*The House recessed from 1014 to 1030.*

## WEARING OF RIBBONS

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I believe we have unanimous consent that all members be permitted to wear purple ribbons in recognition of Epilepsy Ontario and the Epilepsy Cure Initiative's Epilepsy Action Day.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The minister has asked for unanimous consent. Do we have unanimous consent? Agreed.

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** I'd like to welcome some guests who are here for Epilepsy Action Day: Margaret Maye; her husband, Gary Neumann; her son Thomas Drag; and his friend Margaret Aniol. They are all here to raise awareness about the issues surrounding epilepsy.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I am very delighted to welcome all of the representatives of the Epilepsy Cure Initiative and Epilepsy Ontario.

**Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn:** I'd like to extend a warm welcome this morning to some family members of our page Katie: her aunt Sheila Burkman is with us today, as well as her grandparents Patricia and Richard Gorwill.

**Mr. Frank Klees:** I would like to extend a welcome to the grade 5 class from Aurora Senior Public School, along with their teacher, Ms. Lindsay Clement.

**Mr. John Vanthof:** It's my pleasure to introduce the mayor of Temagami, John Hodgson.

**Hon. Michael Gravelle:** I want to introduce some guests from Thunder Bay: the president and vice-chancellor of Lakehead University, Dr. Brian Stevenson, and director of alumni relations, Richard Longtin. Actually, I also see the president of the Thunder Bay Chamber of Commerce, Harold Wilson.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, Lakehead University will have the first northern Ontario faculty of law coming in 2013—the first new law school in Ontario in 42 years. So welcome. We're very excited to have you here.

**Mrs. Julia Munro:** I'd like to welcome the students from Our Lady of Good Counsel School from my riding who will be joining us momentarily.

**Miss Monique Taylor:** Today, I'd like to introduce Mr. Todd Downey, who is here from Energy and working really hard and who would like to meet with many MPPs of this House regarding the retrofit program.

I'd also like to—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for Don Valley East.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Do you have further guests?

**Miss Monique Taylor:** I was also fortunate enough to meet with Epilepsy this morning, and I would like to introduce Ms. Cynthia Milburn and Ms. Kristin Welton. Thank you very much, and welcome today.

**Mr. Michael Coteau:** I'd like to welcome back to the House former member of Parliament from Don Valley East David Caplan.

**Mr. John O'Toole:** I'd like to introduce members of Epilepsy Ontario's action day here at Queen's Park: Dianne McKenzie is the executive director of Durham region, Deanna MacDonald is the outreach coordinator, and Thom Appleby and Miranda Zeppieri.

**Mr. Bill Mauro:** I'm happy to introduce to the House today Katie Monat. Katie is part of the grade 5 class from Aurora Senior Public School. She's the niece of my executive assistant, Josh Arnold.

I'm also happy to welcome the president of Lakehead University, Brian Stevenson, and the president of our chamber of commerce, Harold Wilson.

**Mr. Steve Clark:** It gives me pleasure to introduce in the west members' gallery Ruth Kitson, the executive director of Community and Primary Health Care in my riding. Welcome.

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I'd like to introduce today—they'll be arriving shortly—Lynn Zeppieri, who is with Epilepsy Peterborough and Area, and Thom Appleby, who is the executive director of Epilepsy Peterborough and Area.

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** I'm pleased today to introduce John Spencer. John is the vice-president of operations at PGI Fabrene, the last remaining operation of their multinational here in Canada, North Bay's largest manufacturer and largest user of power.

**Mr. Garfield Dunlop:** The Minister of Natural Resources probably forgot this, but I wanted to also welcome Dr. Brian Stevenson here today. We have central Ontario's university in the city of Orillia, and it's Lakehead University.

**Mr. Jack MacLaren:** It gives me great pleasure to introduce the family of page Katelyn Hochgeschurz. Katelyn is having her page captain day today, so it's a very special day for her. In the members' gallery is her mother, Colleen Hochgeschurz, and Colleen's sister Linda Warren, who's the aunt of Katelyn, and Katelyn's grandparents Ric and Jan Latimer.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Further introductions? The member from Leeds–Grenville, on the last second.

**Mr. Steve Clark:** Thanks, Speaker. I mentioned them this morning in one of my addresses, but I'd like to

recognize the group from Epilepsy Ontario who came and met with me earlier: Peter Andrews, Pamela Murray and, last but not least, Susan Harrison, who's a constituent of mine. She's with the Epilepsy and Seizure Disorder Resource Centre in Kingston. Welcome.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** It is now time for oral questions.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### PUBLIC TRANSIT

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** My question is to the Premier. Premier, in March 2011 you signed a memorandum of understanding with Mayor Rob Ford to invest \$8.4 billion from the province of Ontario in subways. We in the PC caucus believe that was the right thing to do; world-class cities build subways.

Premier, are you now backing away from your signed memorandum of understanding to build subways with Mayor Rob Ford here in Toronto?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this issue. It's very important to all of us, not just those residing in the Toronto area but to all of Ontario, that Toronto work well for the benefit of not just this community, but all Ontarians.

My colleague references a memorandum that I entered into with Mayor Ford, which is true; we did. But there is a specific provision in that agreement that stipulates that the mayor must seek the approval of the council. This is a matter of respect for the expressed will of the municipal council.

So we're looking forward to continuing to work with the council. We are determined to invest in better public transit, as I say, not just for the benefit of people living in this community, but for all Ontarians.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** The Premier has been backing away from what we think is the right thing: an investment in subways here in Toronto. In 2008, the \$8.4 billion had been set aside. We have a major gridlock problem here in Toronto and the GTA, among the worst in North America.

Premier, you lack a jobs plan. If you want to attract jobs and invest in the city of Toronto, if you want to see a world-class city building subways, we should invest in subways, not tearing up existing streets and taking away lanes permanently. Premier, any good jobs plan will involve a subway investment—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. I'm going to remind the members on the government side that, quite often, what we were having was a question placed without interruption. I'd like to continue that trend and remind members of the opposition that when the answer—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Since all members are making comments, I will take the time to restate what I was saying without interruption, please.

Up until recently, the members on the government side have been relatively quiet while questions are being put. I'd like that to continue. On the government side, when the question is put, I would like quiet for the answer. All members need to hear the question and the answer.

Premier?

1040

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** It's hard to keep up with my honourable colleague's position with respect to subways. There was a time when he wanted to bury subways, and now he wants to give life to subways, so it's hard to keep up with where they stand on subways.

I think our shared responsibility at all times is to respect the expressed will of our municipal councils. The council has spoken on this matter. We think we are getting very close to a decided position. We look forward to working with the council in that regard.

My honourable colleague is late to the party but he is welcome nonetheless. We are strong champions of public transit. We have investments that we're making in this community, in Kitchener–Waterloo and in Ottawa. We want to expand GO Transit throughout much of southern Ontario.

I welcome my honourable colleague's support for the first time for—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Final supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Premier, here's the reality of this situation. This is \$8.4 billion that has been allocated since 2008 flowing through the province of Ontario—100% provincial dollars. It flows through Metrolinx, an agency of the province of Ontario. Clearly, the province has a very important role to play here to make the right decision: to invest in subways, to build underground, not rip up existing streets.

Premier, I don't think you standing on the sidelines is good enough. You standing outside of this is not leadership. If you truly want to break gridlock and attract investment and create jobs, you invest in subways. Will you do the right thing and direct Metrolinx to work with the city to invest in subways in the province of Ontario, not tearing up more and more—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Premier.

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Speaker, we on this side of the House happen to believe that local democracy is pretty important. So unlike the party opposite when they were in government—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Member from Peterborough, come to order. Minister of Transportation, come to order.

Premier.

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** Unlike the party opposite when they were in government, we are not forcing

municipalities into amalgamations that they don't want. We are not downloading new responsibilities. In fact, we're uploading; we're reversing the damage that they put in place.

I ask my honourable colleague, what other considered positions of municipalities across the province of Ontario is he now prepared to disregard and substitute his own personal discretion? I just don't think that is the way to run a railroad. I don't think it's the way to run a provincial government. I think what we have to do is respect local—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Thank you.

New question.

## PUBLIC TRANSIT

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Back to the Premier: We in the PC caucus believe world-class cities build subways. It's the right thing to do. It will help bring jobs and investment to the province of Ontario.

Premier, just to make sure the record is clear, you did force Innisfil into Barrie. You forced the amalgamation base of Innisfil into Barrie without compensation. When you announced the expansion of the subway network into Vaughan, you didn't go through this process; you made the right decision to extend it into Vaughan. We think the right decision today is for the Eglinton crosstown route underground, not tearing up streets.

I think the mayor was very clear in the most recent election that he was going to stop the gravy train and he was going to build subways. He had vast support across the city. It's time for some leadership on this issue, Premier. Will you invest in subways and help—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Premier.

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation.

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** I think the Leader of the Opposition should know that many of the transit systems in major world-class cities have hybrid systems. They have subways, buses and light rail. Let me just review some of the world-class cities that have subways and LRT: These include Boston, Paris, Geneva, Sydney, Calgary, Edmonton, Jerusalem, London, Houston, Berlin, Dublin, Tokyo, Vienna, Brussels, Prague, Bordeaux, Amsterdam, Oslo, Barcelona, Stockholm, Edinburgh, Ottawa, Baltimore, San Francisco and Adelaide.

And you know something? Toronto is a world-class city. Toronto has a hybrid system, and this is the right decision to make.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Hold on a second here: Now you're saying this is the right decision to be made. This has been a change in position, I say to the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure. Now you're saying it's the right thing to rip up city streets, to take away lanes per-

manently on Finch, on Eglinton, on Sheppard. That's what the minister has said.

So, clearly, if you think that that's the right decision, you'd better tell the Premier, because the Premier seems to say he has no opinion on this.

We have an opinion. We're clear. We believe you should invest in subways. We live in Canada. You should build it underground to break gridlock, and it's what commuters prefer. Minister, your own Metrolinx chairman, Bruce McCuaig, said on February 6, 2012, in the National Post that the subway version of the Eglinton Crosstown delivered better results.

We think it's the right thing to do. You want to tear up city streets. I ask you to reconsider: Will you support the right thing and build underground, not—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Minister?

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** Mr. Speaker—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Be seated, please. Thank you.

Minister?

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** Mr. Speaker, we believe in the democratic process. We respect municipalities.

I'm going to choose my words very carefully: In 22 years as an elected official, the resolution of the Leader of the Opposition is the most intellectually shallow, uninformed and politically opportunistic I have ever seen. He asks us to respect the memorandum of understanding. The memorandum of understanding was signed by the mayor. The mayor knowingly put a condition in respecting city council, by making the agreement conditional on city council approval. So the mayor is showing disrespect for his own agreement that he negotiated and signed.

We are showing respect to the city council and we are showing respect for the memorandum of understanding that we signed with the mayor.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Final supplementary?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** You know, the minister talks about respecting democracy. Mayor Ford ran in a race of 40 candidates and he said two things: He said he would stop the gravy train and he said he'd build subways. He received 47% of the vote on that in a 40-field race. So for the minister to say that that position is intellectually shallow is an insult to the voters in the city of Toronto who endorsed this plan.

Clearly, Minister, the right thing to do for convenience for travellers, to attract investment to the city, to attract more jobs and to break gridlock is to build subways; to build underground. This is a time for provincial leadership. It flows from the province of Ontario—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Question?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** It's a provincial agency. Will you do the right thing to help create jobs in Toronto and our province and endorse the plan supported by—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Minister?

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** Speaker, we support local government. We support local government by being fiscally responsible, by supporting—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I absolutely want to know what you guys had for breakfast.

I have asked all sides and all members to tone it down a little, and I'm asking one more time. I will tell you, to make it perfectly clear: When I name someone, it's as a result of one and only one warning. That's all I do, and I think you know that.

I'm asking you: I'd like to hear, as do most members, and I don't like it when somebody's answering and then someone on the same side is heckling or someone is asking a question and someone on the same side is shooting comments. At least let the questions get out.

1050

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** And I don't need the reminder.

Carry on.

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, our Toronto Liberal caucus advocated for, and was able to obtain, a commitment of \$8.4 billion for the transit users in the city of Toronto. That's a tremendous commitment to local government.

Something the Leader of the Opposition likes to gloss over, having taken fiscal responsibility in his own mind, is that building entirely underground transit on Sheppard, Eglinton and Finch would cost more than \$15 billion, at least \$7 billion more than the \$8.4 billion that we have on the table. Will the Leader of the Opposition—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Nepean—Carleton, come to order.

**Hon. Bob Chiarelli:** —support additional taxes to pay for the subway that he is now saying he wants—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question?

## JOB CREATION

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My question is to the Premier. In February 2011—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from St. Catharines, come to order.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** —the government signed a contract with Silicon Knights in St. Catharines to the tune of \$2.5 million. They promised to create 90 jobs and sustain a further 100 jobs. Instead, they laid off 45 employees. Last November, the Premier told this Legislature that one instalment of provincial money had been provided to the company.

Exactly how much money has Silicon Knights received to date, and have further instalments since been made?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Economic Development and Innovation.

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** As is becoming a pattern with NDP questions, they continue to ask questions about investments that have been made, expecting, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps we shouldn't be working with businesses across this province, we shouldn't be working to attract foreign direct investment, that we should be ignoring that responsibility to create jobs and promote economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, we've been working very closely with Silicon Knights. It actually is a very fascinating company, a company with great potential. We'll continue to work very closely with them. They're in a field, Mr. Speaker, that's a challenging field, that does have ups and downs. We're willing to continue to work with them. We'll ensure that anything that would be invested in that company—and nothing has been yet, but anything that would be invested—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Speaker, the government has censored the contract that we obtained through freedom of information. It's also refusing to release the jobs targets for the support of the multi-billion dollar hedge fund, Apex funds. In fact, the copy of the Silicon Knights contract that we obtained contained one appendix, consisting of only 26 censored pages.

Don't the people of Ontario have a right to know how their money is being spent and whether companies that are getting public money are meeting their job creation targets?

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition brought up the Apex application or the Apex grant yesterday. Let me talk about that a little bit. This is a \$350,000 contribution over five years. Mr. Speaker, this just was approved in November, so this is something that's over five years. Again, no money has flowed to Apex yet. They will be creating 50 jobs, but they'll be investing \$17 million in our economy. That's a pretty darned good leverage rate for the \$350,000 that we're investing, and they're investing it in our financial institutions sector, a sector we are a global leader in. This is creating jobs in the financial services sector. It's important—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Final supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Well, Speaker, I have to say that initially we were told there were going to be 90 jobs created, and now the minister says there's going to be 50 jobs created. I guess they really don't know whether there are going to be any jobs created whatsoever.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Member from Durham, come to order.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** You know, the government did censor our contracts; they're not giving us the information. I think it's pretty clear that what we need in Ontario is a much more targeted approach to job creation. There are far too many examples where companies that

are taking the public's money are firing rather than hiring here in Ontario.

Can Ontario families expect anything at all from this government? Can they expect jobs to actually be created from their financial support? Or do we see more examples of things like Silicon Knights, where good money seems to be going after bad?

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** The strategic jobs and investment fund has invested \$206 million in Ontario businesses. It has leveraged \$2.8 billion of investments from the private sector. It has supported or created 5,400 jobs. I think that's good for Ontario's economy. I think that's good for Ontario workers.

I want to thank the NDP for supporting the southwest Ontario development fund yesterday. I want to thank them for supporting the eastern Ontario development fund. But, Mr. Speaker, if they support those funds, why would they not be supporting the strategic jobs and investment fund that's bringing foreign direct investment into—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

## JOB CREATION

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** My next question is also to the Premier. A targeted approach to job creation means rewarding companies that actually create jobs that will last in Ontario. Unfortunately for families in Niagara, Silicon Knights isn't the only example of a company that has taken public money and cut jobs. Last month, St. Catharines-based New Food Classics took a government grant of \$1 million and then closed up shop. Why is public money going to companies that are laying people off in Ontario?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Economic Development and Innovation.

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** As I've said many times, there are accountability mechanisms within all of these grants that are forwarded, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, we take those accountability mechanisms very seriously. But when you look at the amount of grants that go out, our economic development funds have leveraged \$8.6 billion of private sector investment in our economy. Imagine where our economy would be without that \$8.6 billion. That's created 12,000 new jobs in Ontario and protected 19,300 jobs.

Where we may be able to agree with the leader of the third party is that we feel we need to do something that the Drummond report recommended: We need to consolidate some of these programs. We need to look at a one-window approach. We've been very clear that that's the direction we plan to go in. Mr. Speaker, we're looking forward to doing that, and I welcome the support of the leader of the third party in accomplishing that.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** Families in Niagara, in London, in Toronto, in Thunder Bay are all concerned

about jobs. Not only are there nearly 600,000 people without a job in this province, but a recent poll found that more than one quarter of Ontarians are worried that somebody in their family is going to lose their job. Instead of a jobs plan, we are seeing example after example of companies taking public money and closing up shop. Isn't it time for tax measures in this province that really reward the job creators?

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** Mr. Speaker, let me just use a few examples of companies that have worked with us, partnered with us to create jobs:

—in the riding of Carleton–Mississippi Mills, Ciena Canada: 353 new jobs, supporting 967 million jobs; that's with a grant from the province of \$25 million;

—the General Electric Smart Grid: We're providing \$7.9 million, and the number of jobs being created is 146; that's in the riding of Mississauga–Streetsville;

—Huawei Technologies Canada: They're announcing a \$6.5-million investment, with 164 jobs in all being created; again, that's in the riding of Carleton–Mississippi Mills.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Hamilton East–Stoney Creek, come to order, please.

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** I could go on and on and on, Mr. Speaker.

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I just asked for order, member.

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** On this side of the House, we're concerned. We're determined to continue to create jobs. We'll continue to partner with companies and make smart investments—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Final supplementary?

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** There's an unemployment rate of 9% and 25,000 people without a job in the city of London. Windsor's unemployment rate is nearly 11%, and 15,000 people can't find work in Oshawa. For families in these communities, stories of companies packing up after taking public money leave them shaking their head in absolute disbelief. Will families soon see a job creation program that actually works for them, or is it going to be more of the same in Ontario?

1100

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** This government is going to continue to invest in our people. We're going to continue to ensure that we have the best-trained workforce in the world.

It's not by accident that we're the second most desirable destination for foreign direct investment. That's not by accident. That's because we've put in place the fundamentals to build a strong economy, the strongest workforce in the world, one of the most competitive tax environments in the world, investments in infrastructure and a commitment to an agenda on innovation. All of these things combined helped us create 121,000 net new jobs last year in the province of Ontario. All of those

things combined helped us ensure that we created over 300,000 net new jobs since the recession.

We're going to keep creating jobs. We're going to keep moving forward—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** To the Minister of Health: Yesterday, the Minister of Health admitted that she knew nothing about an international directive that issued warnings about the structural integrity of the 10 AW139 helicopters in service at Ornge. Today, I want to ask the minister if she is aware that an Ornge-contracted PC-12 medicav Pilatus fixed-wing aircraft crash-landed at the Timmins Airport on January 13 of this year. The reason: Its single engine failed.

What does the minister know about this incident? And can she tell us what she thinks about the decision by Ornge to purchase 10 Pilatus fixed-wing, single-engine aircraft to serve in our air ambulance service?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, what I do know is that the member has made various allegations in this House and outside this House. We always follow up to ensure that whatever steps can be taken have been taken. Most often, those allegations turn out to be completely unfounded, as was the allegation the member opposite made yesterday.

We have put in place very strong leadership at Ornge, and I thought it might be helpful to actually inform the people who are concerned about this issue about the calibre of people who are now in charge at Ornge. Ian Delaney, who is the chair of the corporate governance committee and chair of the board, is the chairman of Sherritt International Corp. and he served as president and chief executive officer. He has also served in executive positions at Viridian, the Horsham Corp., Merrill Lynch Canada Inc. over the past—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** The allegations I made yesterday were confirmed by people at Ornge. It shows what the minister knows about this.

Once again, we have to marvel at how much the minister can be kept out of the loop about what's going on both at Ornge and in her ministry. Once again, we have to question the decision of the leadership at Ornge for making the decision to purchase those single-engine aircraft. No other jurisdiction in this country uses single-engine aircraft for their air ambulance services. BC, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Quebec and Newfoundland all use twin-engine aircraft. When the minister and her cabinet colleagues travel, they use twin-engine aircraft.

I've been asked by the pilots and the paramedics of our front-line service to ask the minister if she would venture a guess as to why two engines would be better than one?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Thank you.

Minister?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I think it's important that the people of this province understand that the plane that the member opposite refers to—he tried to leave the impression it was an Ornge aircraft. It was not an Ornge aircraft.

However, let me talk some more about the people who are now in leadership positions at Ornge. Charles Harnick is a member of the corporate governance committee, human resources and compensation committee and the audit committee of the board. Charles Harnick, Q.C. is a founding principal of Counsel Public Affairs Inc. He's a mediator and arbitrator on the panel of Yorkstreet Dispute Resolution Group. He served as Attorney General of the province of Ontario and minister of native affairs from 1995-99 and as MPP for Willowdale. He was awarded the law society medal in 2005 and sits as—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** Ma question est pour le premier ministre.

Premier, I have been asking questions about Ornge for quite a few weeks now, but unfortunately many of these questions remain unanswered. In order to move on, in order to rebuild trust in our air ambulance system, we need to know who knew what, when.

My question is simple, Mr. Speaker: When did the Premier learn that at least three employees in his office, including his principal secretary, were aware of Ornge for-profit schemes and ventures?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Health.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** It's on the public record that there was a meeting in January with Ornge and members of my staff and my ministry that reviewed some of the changes that were being made at Ornge on the corporate side.

Unfortunately, we did not have the tools we needed to prevent that from happening; this work was under way.

I will be introducing new legislation very shortly that will require the minister to approve any changes that could have prevented what we have seen.

The OPP is investigating the financial irregularities. The Auditor General is releasing his report. I've asked them to release that as quickly as possible.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question was not to the Minister of Health, my question was to the Premier, so back to the Premier.

In January 2011, we all know that a 35-page briefing note was given to the Premier's office, including Jamison Steeve, the Premier's right-hand man. It detailed a complex web of for-profit companies connected to Ornge and

its executives. It referred to extra pay for some of its executives, including Dr. Mazza.

When was the Premier made aware that these schemes were going on, and why the delay before action?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, there was no delay in action. We were aware that there was a complex web of corporations that was being created. We received assurances from Ornge that there was no intermingling of public funds and private funds. We attempted to get answers to questions to verify that assertion by Ornge. We failed to get those answers. They did not provide us with the information we needed, which is exactly why a few months later, we took the action we did: We sent in a forensic audit team; we replaced the CEO; we replaced the entire board of directors. This matter is now with the OPP.

#### WOMEN'S ISSUES

**Ms. Dipika Damerla:** My question today is for the minister responsible for women's issues.

As we all know, this is International Women's Week. As a matter of fact, International Women's Day has now been observed for 100 years.

As we all know, the 1900s were a time of great change in the status of women because that's when women began to agitate and advocate for equal rights. Since then, International Women's Day has gained broad acceptance across the developing world and the developed world. As a matter of fact, it is an official holiday in many countries such as: Armenia, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cuba, Georgia, Eritrea and Zambia.

This week, I believe, is a recognition of how far women have come but also a time to reflect as to how much further we still have to go. For instance, women still experience much higher rates of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell this House what the government is doing to improve the economic status of women in Ontario?

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** Thank you very much, Speaker, and I want to thank the member for Mississauga East—Cooksville for raising this important issue and bringing the importance of International Women's Day and International Women's Week to the floor of this Legislature.

Issues surrounding the economic independence of women are very complex, and that's why I'm so proud to have been part of a government, to be part of a government, that deals with these issues in a cross-ministerial fashion.

There's excellent work being done by the Ontario Women's Directorate with respect to ensuring that women have programs for IT training, for skilled trades and technical programs. Whether it's at Mohawk College in Hamilton, Conestoga College in Waterloo or Collège Boréal in Timmins, women are receiving the skills and training that they need to lift themselves and their families into a better future, and that's something that everyone in this Legislature should—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

1110

**Ms. Dipika Damerla:** Minister, there are challenges around women in the core working age group, from 25 to 44, and participating in the workforce, something I'm sure some women in this Legislature might be able to relate to. Women also remain significantly under-represented in leadership positions in the private sector. For instance, men are more than twice as likely as women to hold senior management positions. This hasn't changed in almost 20 years. Men are also one and a half times more likely to have positions in middle management.

Many of the women are not working because of the high costs of child care. Speaker, will the minister tell us what this government is doing to increase access to child care?

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** I'm very pleased to be part of a government that invested \$63.5 million per year to permanently fill the child care funding gap left by the federal government. Through the investments we've created, nearly 43,000 more children are receiving fee subsidies each year. We've created 22,000 new licensed child care spaces. We've increased investments in child care over the past eight years by 46%, and that's in addition to the investments in all-day kindergarten: \$1.5 billion at full investment, Speaker.

We know that there continues to be work to do with respect to modernizing child care, but I can tell you that we are proud of the record of this government. We stepped in when government stepped away, and we did not see allies in the fight for child care.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mr. Frank Klees:** To the Minister of Health: Speaker, the minister continues to refer to the leadership team that is now in charge at Ornge and expresses great confidence in their ability. The truth is that there is a new volunteer board and a CEO who has no experience in air ambulance. However, we also know that the two individuals who are in control of the day-to-day operations at Ornge are Mr. Rick Potter and Mr. Steve Farquhar. Not only were these two individuals intimately involved in the helicopter purchase that's now under criminal investigation, they were involved in the decisions that resulted in operational decisions that put patients and crews at risk.

I ask the minister this: Why has she embraced Mr. Potter and Mr. Farquhar as key members of the so-called new leadership team at Ornge? Knowing their role in the past, why has she endorsed those two individuals?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Speaker, I have complete confidence in the new board of directors at Ornge, and there was a time when the member from Newmarket-Aurora also had confidence in that team.

Let me introduce the people of Ontario to yet another member of this new board of directors: Barry McLellan.

He is the chair of the medical oversight committee at Ornge and a member of the corporate governance committee. He's the president and CEO of Sunnybrook Hospital. Prior to this position, Dr. McLellan was the chief coroner for Ontario. He's a professor in the department of surgery at the University of Toronto. He's a graduate of the University of Toronto, with a medical doctorate, in 1981. He subsequently trained in emergency medicine, receiving a fellowship in 1985. He was the director of the trauma program and vice-president of specialty services at Sunnybrook and was also the director of the—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Speaker, anyone watching the proceedings here today will know that a board of directors has nothing to do with the day-to-day operations of an organization.

The minister's credibility is wearing thin. She has publicly denounced Mr. Potter for falsifying his credentials. When asked what she would do if a member of her own staff resorted to the kind of behaviour that Mr. Potter demonstrated, she said, "I would fire him." She's heard repeatedly that Mr. Potter and Mr. Farquhar were at the centre of decisions that put patients and crews at risk, and yet the minister continues to herald them as key members of her leadership team.

There's nothing new at Ornge. The same people are in charge. Why does the minister refuse to see that and continue to endorse people who quite frankly have the credibility—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Minister of Health.

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** I have complete confidence in the new board at Ornge. I tell you, I have a lot more confidence in them than I do in the member from Newmarket-Aurora.

Let me introduce another member of the board, Patrice Merrin. Patrice is the chair of the human resources and compensation committee. She's a member of the corporate governance committee and medical oversight committee. She's the chairman of the board of CML Healthcare Inc., a leading provider of medical laboratory testing services in Ontario and the largest provider of diagnostic imaging in Canada. She's a former president and CEO of Luscar Canada, Canada's largest thermal coal producer. She's a director of the Climate Change and Emissions Management Corp. and is a former director of the NB Power Group. She has served on many not-for-profit boards, including as a trustee of her alma mater, Queen's University.

#### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** Mr. Speaker, Ontario's auto insurance companies—

**Interjection:** To whom?

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** My apologies, Mr. Speaker. This question is to the Minister of Finance.

Ontario's auto insurance companies are reporting huge profits, in fact, while accident victims are suffering due to government cutbacks in 2010. For example, Co-operators reported profits of \$150.3 million in 2011, up 100% from the year before. Co-operators explained, "Significant improvements year over year can be attributed to favourable claims experience in the Ontario automobile insurance portfolio."

Will the minister admit that slashing auto insurance coverage benefits big insurance companies and not drivers and accident victims?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, Ontario's coverage is as robust as in every other province in the country. Now, the member opposite doesn't want to acknowledge that insurance rates have come down considerably, doesn't want to acknowledge his own party's checkered history on these issues.

I think you have to listen carefully. They spoke this way prior to becoming a government, Mr. Speaker. They said that public auto insurance was the way to go. Then, lo and behold, they became government, and they rejected public auto insurance.

Our record is different. Our record is a record of bringing down insurance premiums. Our record is making auto insurance more accessible to people. It's a record of building a better insurance system for all Ontarians that's saving all Ontarians money each and every day of the year.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Jagmeet Singh:** Through you, Mr. Speaker, again to the Minister of Finance: Let's talk about the Minister of Finance's and Ontario's track record. In December, I raised the fact that insurance companies are basing their premiums not on drivers' records but on where they live and what neighbourhood they live in in Ontario. The same driver with the same age, gender, marital status, driving record and car model will pay over 150% more simply based on where they live in Ontario. That's simply unfair.

When will this minister put an end to this practice so that people's premiums are based on their driving record, not based on where they live and what neighbourhood they come from?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, assessment procedures are the same in virtually every jurisdiction.

What the member opposite doesn't recall is that when his party was in power, insurance premiums went up almost 27%, as opposed to ours, which have been at or below the rate of inflation over eight years.

My most recent package of reforms gives people more choice. Choice is important. For instance, the type of car you drive is important. If you drove a Chrysler that was made in Windsor or Brampton, you'd probably get a lower rate than if you drove an expensive sports car like a BMW. I think that kind of choice, Mr. Speaker, is extremely important to consumers. We're seeing rates coming down day in and day out.

I welcome the member's further questioning. I can assure him that under this government, insurance rates—

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Stop the clock, please. I point out that I stopped the clock—a little unorthodox, but the Speaker does have a little bit of leeway in this.

As invited guests of mine, in the Speaker's gallery today we have His Worship Rev. Mark Curtis. And the dad of all dads, Walter Gretzky, is with us—

1120

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Is he taking over Joe Peters's club?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** He's my other brother.

I thank you for your indulgence and move to a new question. We'll start the clock.

## LONG-TERM CARE

**Mr. David Zimmer:** Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care. I'm hearing from my constituents up in Willowdale, especially the seniors and their children. They're getting anxious about long-term care. The seniors expect and, indeed, their children expect that when the seniors need it, they'll get it. Their clear sense is that they've earned it over the years, and they're entitled to it.

I understand and I realize that we've made some great progress in long-term care in recent years, but those seniors and their parents in Willowdale still want to hear and know that we're going to guarantee long-term-care availability for them when they need it, that we're committed to long-term care.

Minister, what are you doing to assure seniors and their families that you're committed to long-term care?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you to the wonderful member from Willowdale for this thoughtful question. I'm very happy to take this opportunity to talk about what we've done for residents in long-term care.

We've made significant progress in creating new beds and improving services and care in long-term care. We've opened 9,100 new beds across the province, and we've redeveloped thousands more. We've increased funding—because funding does matter when it comes to long-term care—by almost 80%. We spend \$3.76 billion each year on long-term care.

We will continue to invest in long-term care, but our healthy change action plan is shifting our focus to provide more supports in the community. We'll be creating more capacity in homes and in the community, because that's where people want to be for as long as they possibly—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. Supplementary?

**Mr. David Zimmer:** Minister, here's what triggered the concerns up in Willowdale from seniors and their children. There have been a number of recent reports, particularly this last fall, that brought really significant attention to some of the long-term-care issues and raised

a whole lot of concerns about the safety of seniors in the homes. The reports dealt with things that no one ever expected to hear about and no one wants to hear about and, indeed, should never happen in Ontario or anywhere.

Since these reports have come to light, there's been this new anxiety about the future of long-term care and our government's commitment to it. Minister, what are you doing to deal with the issues that raised these concerns? And how are we going to assure the seniors that we've dealt with the issues so they are confident in our long-term-care prospects?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** We all have very big expectations of long-term-care homes. After all, they have the responsibility to care for the most vulnerable people in our health care system, to provide them with care and to treat them with respect and with dignity.

The reports that the member refers to demonstrated that we must continue to do better, and that's why I called together representatives from the parents' associations, the residents and the long-term-care providers, and they have now launched a task force. That work is under way, focusing on what we need to do to further protect the residents in long-term care. This task force is open to the public for comment. The task force website is [longtermcareairetaskforce.ca](http://longtermcareairetaskforce.ca). I would encourage anyone who wants to contribute to this work to take the time to do that.

They will be reporting back by the end of April. That report will be made public. We all have a shared—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you. New question.

#### AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** My question is for the Minister of Health. On October 25, 2011, the emergency health services branch of the ministry was notified that Ornge is violating the Ambulance Act.

Ron Smith, director of transportation for the union representing paramedics, wrote your ministry and called for an investigation into understaffing at Ornge. Mr. Smith said, "The actions of Ornge allow for potential harm and injury to both patient and paramedics. We feel that this is a violation of the Ambulance Act, land ambulance certification standards, and basic and advanced life support patient care standards."

Can the minister confirm she is aware of this allegation that patients and paramedics are being put at risk, and will she inform us about the outcome of the investigation?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Thank you to the member opposite. The ministry has a very robust process. They follow up on absolutely every complaint that comes to them. They do it in a thorough way, and they do not close the file until they are satisfied that the appropriate steps have been taken.

But we do think there's more we can do. That is why, under the new legislation and the new performance

agreement, we will actually be putting in place quality improvement performance measures, just like we have done in our hospitals. We know that if we measure quality, we can improve quality. So we look forward to improving even further the quality of care that is provided at Ornge.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** Again to the minister, because the minister did not respond to the question. I repeat: The date of the request was made on October 25, 2011, not all that long ago. It was under your watch. It was for an investigation to be made by your ministry, not Ornge, and I quote again from the letter: "We believe (this) to be a violation of the Ambulance Act and request that your ministry investigate these allegations and take action as necessary to stop this practice."

Minister, I ask you today: Are you aware of the many, many issues within your ministry and the concerns at Ornge, and will you now acknowledge, since obviously you've not indicated your awareness of them, that it's time for a select committee to be set up in order that we can get to the bottom of it?

**Hon. Deborah Matthews:** Part of the responsibility of the emergency health services branch of our ministry is investigating complaints that come from air ambulance but also from land ambulance. They do their work in a very diligent and systematic way. I can tell you that the number of investigations that my ministry undertakes has been fairly consistent over the past several years. But I want to make it very clear that every incident that is reported is investigated. It's important that we learn from problems, that we learn from mistakes, that we continue to improve the quality of care.

I am very much aware of the work of the branch, of this particular unit that does investigations, and I can assure you they are very, very diligent in their work.

#### TAXATION

**Mr. Michael Prue:** My question is to the Premier. Last year, the government changed the way low- and modest-income people received their income tax refunds. You made the change without consultation with the people who were affected, and they had literally no idea of your change of regulation.

Robin Smith, a working mother of two, wrote to me last week. She was going to use her tax refund to put a down payment on a car so she could take her children camping or to visit relatives.

Will this government work with Ontarians who choose to have their refunds paid as a lump sum and give them the choice by simply changing the regulation?

**Hon. Dalton McGuinty:** To the Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** The member opposite is absolutely correct. It wasn't just income tax refunds; in fact, it was tax credits. We made the deliberate choice to flow money throughout the year, so every month people of more modest means will get their cash flow rather than have the province sit on it. So, yesterday, I indicated I

will be bringing forward a regulatory change to give people choice.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?  
1130

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Thank you very much to the Minister of Finance for agreeing to do that.

The question, though, still remains: Why did the government choose to pass this regulation in secret, and why did they withhold this from the people who were affected? Why did they have to find out when they were expecting their income tax?

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** There was overwhelming advice to do this, Mr. Speaker. Again, when you look at the sales tax credits that people get, with now the Ontario Trillium benefit, people have cash flow every month. This is designed to help people as they deal with their monthly expenses.

*Interjection.*

**Hon. Dwight Duncan:** A member opposite reminds me it is, in fact, their money, Mr. Speaker. We didn't think it was appropriate to continue to hold on to that money. I've heard from others since we introduced this benefit—and remember, Mr. Speaker, most of the tax credits contained in that were passed by this government and voted against by the Conservatives. That's energy and property tax credits for seniors, that's a whole range of credits.

This is all about making sure people, particularly of more modest means, have income flow. But yes, we have announced that we will be giving them choice.

## ENERGY POLICIES

**Ms. Helena Jaczek:** My question is for the Minister of Energy. Minister, just last week, it was made public that Environment Canada is exploring the possibility of reducing coal use in Canada. As a physician, I know there are serious health concerns, but there are also economic costs associated with burning dirty coal. I'm pleased to see that the rest of Canada may be following Ontario's lead by phasing out dirty coal-fired generation and replacing this source of power with cleaner sources like wind and solar.

Minister, can you please share with the House the economic impacts of getting out of this dirty form of electricity?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** The member from Oak Ridges–Markham, as a former medical officer of health and a physician, has rightly identified a very important fact here. Getting out of coal is not only the right thing to do for the environment but, most importantly, it's the right thing to do for our health. When we talk about the \$4 billion a year it costs Ontario taxpayers in their health system by burning dirty coal, it's important to know what is behind that \$4 billion.

Getting out of coal will mean 668 or more fewer premature deaths every year. It will mean over 900 fewer hospital admissions. It means over 330,000 fewer illnesses. This is an incredible human cost that's being

avoided, a cost that is borne not only by those people affected and their families, but by the taxpayers. That's why getting out of coal is the right thing to do.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Ms. Helena Jaczek:** Thank you, Minister. My constituents in Oak Ridges–Markham and all Ontarians expect clean air, but they also need a strong and successful economy. We need to do everything we can to ensure they have good-paying jobs in stable industries, and that is why it's so important to ensure that Ontario's clean energy economy remains a global leader and continues to attract jobs and investment.

Despite the official opposition's constant call to end green energy in Ontario, companies continue to succeed and create jobs. Minister, can you please tell us what the future of our clean energy economy looks like?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** Once again, the member is absolutely right. We're getting out of coal in a way that not only brings on clean, green energy, but helps create an economy here in the province of Ontario that is green.

We have solar manufacturers from Welland, throughout the north GTA part of Toronto into the east. We have wind manufacturers who are not only located in Tillsonburg, but down in Windsor. We have the related electricians and the plumbers. But we're building on that. There are already 20,000 jobs directly related to green energy; we're on the route to 50,000. That's 50,000 families who are benefiting from our investments in clean energy in Ontario.

## RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** My question is for the Minister of Energy. Good morning, Minister.

Minister, there are two words on every employer's energy bill that were not there a couple of years ago: global adjustment. This new charge is to pay for your solar and wind subsidies.

In the first year, Ontario employers paid \$700 million in global adjustment. The Auditor General told us they will pay \$8 billion in global adjustment in 2014.

Minister, your failed energy plan is bankrupting Ontario businesses, costing us thousands of jobs. How many more families have to suffer before you cancel the FIT subsidies?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** Speaker, we know where we started in 2003. We started with diesel generators on the street corner, we started with coal production at 25%, and we started with a transmission system that had been left alone for years.

Ontario families and businesses need reliable power, and Ontario families and businesses have been doing a lot of work the last eight years: doing work that should have been done under the previous government.

We also recognize, as the previous question indicated, that Ontario families and businesses were paying the real cost: the real cost of burning that coal, \$4 billion, and all the thousands of illnesses that hurt productivity and hurt families. We refuse to pay the health costs. We refuse to

have an unreliable system. We're investing in a clean, reliable, jobs-producing system in Ontario.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Supplementary?

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** Speaker, earlier I introduced John Spencer in the gallery, from North Bay. Fabrene is the multinational's last remaining operation here in Canada. Their global adjustment bill last year, that new line item on their bill, was \$1 million. So instead of hiring 15 new people, they used that money to pay for the Liberal failed energy plan.

Minister, if you can't answer me about global adjustment, will you look John Spencer in the eye and tell him why he should pay you a million dollars in global adjustment next year?

*Interjections.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Be seated, please. Thank you.

Minister?

**Hon. Christopher Bentley:** Thank you very much, Speaker.

We very much believe not only in reliable but in affordable power that is good for the people of Ontario and good for our industry. That is why we took some steps just within the last year with respect to the global adjustment charge in businesses that help them greatly reduce the overall cost of power. That is why we have taken additional measures for businesses to find ways to conserve through retrofits, to make sure that they can reduce the pressure on their bottom line, and that's why our overall strategy with respect to tax reductions, with respect to the harmonized tax, with respect to one collection point, with respect to the reduction of the cost of machinery and investment, the tax cost, is all to make sure that—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

#### USE OF QUESTION PERIOD

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I have two people standing. I saw somebody first. The member from Parkdale–High Park for a point of order.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I call your attention to a breach of standing order 37(d) by the member from Oak Ridges–Markham: "In putting an oral question, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated, except so far as may be necessary," etc. So I would ask for your ruling on that.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I thank the member for the point of order. It is indeed a point of order, but I would also suggest to you that if we stood by that particular rule, we would ask no questions in the House, and I would also suggest to you that there are other rules in the House that say that when someone is standing, there is to be no talking. And I also remind the members on the government side—and all members, for that matter—that we do try to honour the orders as they're written, and I remind members to design their questions such. Thank you for the point of order.

#### MINISTER'S COMMENTS

**Mr. Frank Klees:** My point of order is with regard to standing orders 23(h), (i) and (j), and I refer you, Speaker, to the Minister of Health's response to one of my questions today, in which the minister stated very clearly that the so-called—I quote her—"allegations" that I made yesterday were "unfounded."

According to our standing orders, a member cannot make allegations against another member. She's essentially saying that I put forward in this House an allegation that was without fact, which is not the case.

Standing order 23(i) refers to one member imputing "false or unavowed motives to another member." As I listened to the Minister of Health, clearly that's what she was doing. The reality is—the truth is, Speaker—that the allegations that I brought were factual. If, in fact, the minister has any evidence of any issue that I have brought before this House relating to Ornge or any other issue, I would ask the minister to provide that evidence rather than imputing motive to me and making allegations about my motivations in bringing these matters before the House.

I would ask you, Speaker, to take this matter up. I look forward to hearing from you in terms of the appropriateness of the minister's comments relative to the questions I have put to her.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

I had listened carefully and I did not hear the reference to the standing orders that the member said, but I would also suggest to you that if one says one thing and one says the other thing, that doesn't necessarily translate into impugning one's motive.

I would also suggest to you that I would use the same comment I said with the previous order, and that is to please ask all members to guard themselves against that and make sure you make yourself familiar with the standing orders, particularly those three that often get quoted, to ensure that members are making their discussions based on the questions of the day, and making sure that the answers of the day try to answer the questions. Thank you.

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** On the same point.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** On the same point of order, the member from Simcoe–Grey.

**Mr. Jim Wilson:** On behalf of our caucus and the honourable member from Newmarket–Aurora, we understand, perhaps, that you didn't hear the minister's comments. They were quite clear in impugning motive against a colleague, and we would ask you to review Hansard and further deliberate on this matter.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** As I indicated, I believe there's a disagreement between what was heard in the form of whether or not they were applying to the standing orders. I repeat myself again: I did not hear that, and I've made my ruling.

Same order? I've made my ruling. If it's a different order—

**Mr. Frank Klees:** No, Speaker, if I might. I respect the challenge that you've put forward to members, and that is to familiarize themselves with the standing orders. It's precisely because over the last 17 years here I have familiarized myself with those standing orders; I make every effort to respect them. What I'm concerned about is that we have yet one more circumstance here where a cabinet minister has offended those standing orders, and I am asking you—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you, member. I believe I've made it clear that I've made my ruling on this, and that will be the end of it.

There are no votes. This House stands recessed until 3 o'clock this afternoon.

*The House recessed from 1144 to 1500.*

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member from Parkdale.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** High Park, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

They've been introduced already in part, but I just want to introduce again members from the epilepsy action group; in particular, Margaret Maye and her son Thomas, who are here, and Gary Neumann, who is, I'm sure, coming—just to thank them for all their hard work.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I apologize to the member from Parkdale—High Park. I have to start doing this. What I'm doing is putting a “P” in the front of my head, or the letter. It's working, but in yours, I apologize.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** It's an impossible riding to forget.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### EPILEPSY

**Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer:** I would like to take the opportunity to acknowledge that today is Epilepsy Action Day at Queen's Park. Two extremely important organizations, Epilepsy Ontario and the Epilepsy Cure Initiative, are here to raise awareness about the need to improve standards of care and access to treatment.

I'd like to point out that, according to a recent survey, 82% of people living with epilepsy say they depend on medications to help manage seizures. Many of them have been prescribed an average of four different medications since their initial diagnosis.

Lack of seizure control severely impacts one's independence, productivity and overall quality of life. These medications play a vital role in providing epilepsy patients with the ability to live satisfying and productive lives. We need to do all we can to ensure that people with epilepsy are able to live independently, build careers and make contributions to their communities.

Unfortunately, it's difficult for them to do so without access to the necessary medications. Since 2003, only

two new drugs have been approved in Canada for epilepsy treatment. Epilepsy medication is often only available through the Ontario exceptional access program, thereby reducing accessibility. The level and standard of care that we provide to Ontarians with epilepsy must improve.

### EPILEPSY

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** I couldn't agree more with the preceding statement, and I'll add my own.

March is Epilepsy Awareness Month, and International Epilepsy Awareness Day is on March 26. We should know that, next to headaches, it's the most common neurological disorder. In Ontario alone there are 65,000 people with epilepsy, and that is more than the number of people with multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, Parkinson's disease and muscular dystrophy all combined. While there are treatments for seizures, there is no known cure.

The asks of Epilepsy Action and the people here today are twofold. Number one: Ontario's employment support programs do not currently recognize the unique needs of people with epilepsy in the workforce. Despite uncontrolled seizures, many are denied ODSP support because epilepsy is not considered a “substantial” impairment. That has to change.

Number two: Ontarians who suffer from epilepsy should have universal access to quality, evidence-based comprehensive health care through the development and execution of the proposed Ontario epilepsy strategy, as suggested by the Ontario Health Technology Advisory Committee already.

We would ask of the government side that they act on these two asks—and also of the member from Kitchener—Waterloo—and that they really make this a day that we not only remember those with epilepsy but actually do something about it.

### EPILEPSY

**Ms. Helena Jaczek:** Later today, I will table a private member's bill for the Ontario government to recognize the International Epilepsy Awareness Day of March 26 of every year here in Ontario.

March is Epilepsy Awareness Month. Over 250,000 Ontarians are directly affected by this brain disorder, and 1.2 million more people are indirectly affected.

Epilepsy is a seizure disorder brought on by sudden bursts of electrical energy in a person's brain. It can bring on seizures of all types, with the length and severity varying from person to person. While anyone of any age can develop epilepsy, it more commonly appears during the childhood and senior years.

Today, Margaret Maye, my good friend and president and founder of Epilepsy Cure Initiative, and her son, Thomas Drag, are joining us at the Legislature to meet with MPPs to raise awareness of epilepsy in Ontario. Also joining us here at Queen's Park are Rozalyn

Werner-Arcé, the executive director of Epilepsy Ontario; and Dr. Mac Burnham, also of that organization. I urge you to meet with these representatives, who are dedicated to improving the lives of individuals and families affected by epilepsy here in Ontario, and I will be asking for your support of my bill to make March 26 of every year Epilepsy Awareness Day in Ontario.

#### DONALD STEWART “CHIP” GORDON

**Mr. Monte McNaughton:** I'm rising today to pay tribute to Donald Stewart “Chip” Gordon, a long-time community activist and volunteer from my riding of Lambton—Kent—Middlesex.

Whether it was setting up a community fundraiser, organizing a local Christmas dinner, offering political and government expertise, developing a doctor recruitment program or organizing the Canada Day firework celebration, Chip was always there to help.

He was named the Wallaceburg Citizen of the Year in 2009 by the Wallaceburg and District Chamber of Commerce and won the chamber's Good Neighbour Award in 2011. Chip served as a hockey coach and was an inductee into Wallaceburg's Sports Hall of Fame in 2006.

He served his community as a Chatham-Kent municipal councillor from 2000 until 2006 and ran for mayor of Chatham-Kent in the 2006 election. Chip worked tirelessly to promote and organize WAMBO, the Wallaceburg Antique Motor and Boat Outing, since its inception in 1989.

A devoted family man, it was a common sight to see Chip wheeling around WAMBO in a golf cart with his granddaughter. Chip Gordon was the husband of Darlene and the father of Heather and Donnie. He had three grandchildren and was a friend to everyone in the community. Along with the entire Wallaceburg community, we are so thankful for Chip's service over the course of his lifetime.

Thank you, Chip. You will be greatly missed by the province of Ontario and the municipality of Chatham-Kent.

#### ROYAL CANADIAN LEGION PUBLIC SPEAKING CONTEST

**Mr. Michael Mantha:** The Royal Canadian Legion zone H-4 held their youth public speaking contest in Blind River last Saturday. I want to highlight a group of outstanding youth from Algoma-Manitoulin and Sault Ste. Marie who took part in this event.

After speaking to a crowd of over 150 listeners, four of the 27 participants were advanced to the district competition in Sault Ste. Marie to be held on March 31. The youngest winner, grades 1 to 3, was Evan Johnson of Sault Ste. Marie. Evan gave an amusing presentation, coincidentally, on the importance of oral presentations. Eoin Leahy of Sault Ste. Marie won grades 4 to 6 division and spoke on his fabulous trip to India. Maya

Werner from Bruce Mines won the grade 7 to 9 division for her impassioned speech on food insecurity close to home. Maya drove home the point that many people are in need of food in the Algoma-Manitoulin region and that local food banks need help throughout the year.

Perhaps the most emotional moment of the competition came during the speech by grades 10 to 12 division winner Tamara Tait of Wawa. Tamara bravely delivered a powerful speech detailing her private battle with depression and the effect that it had on her young life. Afterwards, Tamara admitted this was the first time she was able to finish her entire speech, but this was in the hope that it would help people understand what people with depression go through.

I want to thank the Royal Canadian Legion for hosting such an event, which helps develop the self-confidence of our young people. I would also like to wish Evan, Eoin, Maya and Tamara the best of luck on March 31 at the district competition.

#### PRIX BERNARD GRANDMAÎTRE

**M. Phil McNeely:** Le 23 février dernier se tenait le 12<sup>e</sup> gala du Prix Bernard Grandmaître, organisé par l'ACFO d'Ottawa. Ce prix a pour but de mettre en lumière les réalisations professionnelles et individuelles d'une personne ainsi que son engagement social dans le domaine de la francophonie.

#### 1510

Nommé en l'honneur de Bernard Grandmaître et créé en 1999, ce prix lui rend hommage publiquement pour son dévouement et son apport indéniable auprès de la communauté franco-ontarienne.

Je tiens donc à féliciter personnellement les gagnants de l'année 2011 :

—Laurier Jeunesse de l'année : Chanel Fournier, d'ailleurs résidente de la circonscription d'Ottawa—Orléans;

—Laurier Organisme de l'année : Espoir UMOJA Hope;

—Laurier Francophile de l'année : M<sup>me</sup> Kathleen Stokely;

—Laurier Intervenant/Intervenante en éducation : M<sup>me</sup> Najat Ghannou; et

—Laurier Citoyen/Citoyenne de l'année : M. Gilles Laporte.

Le récipiendaire du Prix Bernard Grandmaître est l'honorable Jean-Jacques Blais.

Alors, félicitations à tous ces gagnants et gagnantes, et merci pour leur apport à la francophonie d'Ottawa. Merci, monsieur le Président.

**Le Président (L'hon. Dave Levac):** Merci beaucoup.

#### DON LOBB

**Ms. Sylvia Jones:** Too often we spend a disproportionate amount of our time in this Legislature opposing and debating each other on opposing points of view, so it is therefore my pleasure to rise today to recognize the

contributions of a Caledon resident who has led a no-till movement that has recently been recognized internationally.

At the Ontario Soil and Crop Improvement Association conference Don Lobb received the L.B. Thomson Conservation Award. This is particularly significant as Don is the first farmer outside of western Canada to receive this prestigious award.

Don has been working since 1970 to adapt this farmland from conventional tillage to no-till and has shared his findings and knowledge with the industry, universities and government. He has participated in programs focusing on soil quality and crop management, and contributed to the Canada-Ontario Soil and Water Environmental Enhancement Program and environmental farm plans.

Because of his vision and hard work, farmers across Canada are benefiting from the changes in soil management and conservation tillage practices. I'm pleased that Don was acknowledged for this effort in enhancing agricultural food production. Innovative leaders like Don are an inspiration and deserve our recognition, praise and thanks. Thank you, Don.

#### WINDSOR-ESSEX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORP.

**Mrs. Teresa Piruzza:** This past Friday, March 2, I had the pleasure of attending the Windsor-Essex Economic Development Corp.'s report card for the first year of its five-year regional economic roadmap. Collaboration and investments were the key to the success of this strategy.

Over the past year, the Windsor-Essex Economic Development Corp. has announced 1,862 new jobs, \$73 million in new investments, retained over 6,000 jobs, consulted with 1,700 small businesses and responded to 28,000 small business inquiries: clearly a success story by any standard.

The collaboration did not stop there. The region's first prosperity council, WE Prosper, a volunteer collaborative dedicated to addressing community priorities, was also established. Due to their hard work and efforts with its partners, which include our government, my community has benefited from many national and international recognitions, such as a Top Seven Intelligent Community of the Year, highlighting Windsor-Essex as a leader in broadband connectivity, knowledge workforce, innovation and marketing; the Conference Board of Canada's recognition of Windsor-Essex as the region to lead the nation's economic growth—that's right; the region hardest hit by the economic downturn in the province was ranked to be the fastest-growing metropolitan economy in Canada—and Site Selection magazine recognized Windsor-Essex as one of the top five best to invest in in 2011 and as the green tech capital.

The list of successes of my community go on, and the Windsor-Essex Economic Development Corp. can be

credited for being a critical partner in this amazing development.

#### SUICIDE PREVENTION

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** On occasion in this chamber I have risen to talk about two topics that have hit my community: bullying and suicide. In November, a group of very well-respected and knowledgeable people came together through the Ottawa Community Suicide Prevention Network to make real change in our community and make real progress so we could have a suicide-safer city of Ottawa. I was proud to be part of that with my colleague from Ottawa Centre, Yasir Naqvi. Although we come from two very different political mindsets, we agree that suicide and suicide prevention is not a political issue; it's not partisan. So we worked together with some very great innovative thinkers from our community.

That culminated on February 8 with a symposium of over 250 people from our community—from school boards, hospitals and other service providers—to map the path forward. What we came out with was a mapping system for parents whose kids are struggling with suicidal tendencies and depression.

We also put an action plan together—and I shouldn't say "we," because Mr. Naqvi and I were just very proud to be a part of this. Those experts put that together, and they came out with five pillars. They wanted to talk about leadership, training to improve mental health literacy, suicide bereavement for those who are affected, mental health promotion, and the creation of a community action plan to be completed within a year. Speaker, we are doing that.

I know my time has been exceeded, but if the chamber would indulge me to actually name the people that were part of that I would like to do so. I'd like to say, in particular, thanks to Councillor Allan Hubley, whose son died tragically of suicide earlier this year. The Premier's assistant in Ottawa, John Fraser, was a very integral part of that as well. Two great people, George Weber and Joanne Lowe, co-chaired the suicide prevention network, and many of their staff, like Nicole Loreto and Janice Barresi, were there. Steve Madely, who is a morning voice in Ottawa from CFRA, was our moderator. Ian Manion, Peggy Austen, Cathy Curry, Alex Munter, Ann Fuller, Eva Schacherl, Ben Leikin, Raj Bhatla and Renée Ouimet were all part of bringing this community organization together and seeing results.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Thank you.

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, if there's one thing that I'll be proud of when my time in politics comes to an end, it will be this event.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** I thought it was a list.

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** And I'd like to thank the Speaker—

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Oh, you'd better.

Thank you. The time for statements is over. I will now move to reports by committees—

*Interjection.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Whip her into shape, whip.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### EDUCATION AMENDMENT ACT (CONCUSSIONS), 2012

#### LOI DE 2012 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR L'ÉDUCATION (COMMOTIONS CÉRÉBRALES)

Ms. Broten moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 39, An Act to amend the Education Act with respect to concussions / *Projet de loi 39, Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'éducation en ce qui a trait aux commotions cérébrales.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The minister for a short statement.

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** I'll make my statement during ministerial statements.

### EPILEPSY AWARENESS DAY ACT, 2012

#### LOI DE 2012 SUR LA JOURNÉE DE SENSIBILISATION À L'ÉPILEPSIE

Ms. Jaczek moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 40, An Act to proclaim Epilepsy Awareness Day / *Projet de loi 40, Loi proclamant la Journée de sensibilisation à l'épilepsie.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** The member for a short statement.

**Ms. Helena Jaczek:** The intention of this bill is clearly to bring some notice to this disease, epilepsy, by recognizing it each year on March 26, in particular, to recognize the toll that it takes on individuals and their families; the importance of research and best practices; and, probably most significant of all, to address the stigma that is associated with this disease.

1520

## STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES

### CONCUSSIONS COMMOTIONS CÉRÉBRALES

**Hon. Laurel C. Broten:** I rise in the House today to discuss an issue we've heard a lot about over the past year: concussions. Concussions don't discriminate. They can derail the professional career of the best hockey

player in the world just as easily as they can derail the academic career of one of our youngest learners.

I'm proud that this government has, time and time again, shown its commitment and dedication to supporting student success and well-being, and we know that the health of our students is critical to their ability to succeed at school.

In 2009, almost 20,000 emergency hospital visits in Ontario were due to concussions, and some experts have estimated that as many as one in three high school students will sustain a concussion: experts like Dr. Charles Tator and Dr. Paul Echlin, who joined me this morning at the Legislature to talk about this important issue. We've also heard from two impressive and courageous students, Justin Rizek and Molly Tissenbaum, who told their personal stories of how concussions have affected their lives.

Mr. Speaker, only recently has research shown us that multiple concussions may be a more serious matter than what we previously thought, with the potential to cause long-term harmful damage. That is not the future that we want for young people in Ontario.

Monsieur le Président, les professionnels de la santé et les chercheurs s'inquiètent de plus en plus des effets des commotions cérébrales sur la santé, le bien-être et l'apprentissage des jeunes.

There is growing concern among health care professionals and researchers about the effect that concussions can have on young people's health, well-being and learning. Symptoms of a concussion can appear immediately or several hours after an incident, and they vary. They can be physical, causing headaches, dizziness, nausea or even loss of consciousness; cognitive, making it difficult for some people to concentrate, focus or remember; or even emotional, making it difficult for kids who have suffered from concussions to learn new skills and attend to their school work. There is no doubt that head injuries can have a huge impact on learning.

Although most children recover completely from a concussion, sometimes there are major risks and consequences for children returning to play or to learn before they have completely healed. Mr. Speaker, as a mother of two young boys and as Minister of Education, I can tell you that this is a real cause for concern. But there are actions we can take. If head injuries like concussions are identified early and enough time is given for kids to recover, we can make sure that our students succeed in school athletics and, most importantly, succeed in the classroom.

As we have learned more about concussions, we have learned that we are compelled to act. Head injuries like concussions are a serious issue, and we will treat them that way. We all have a role to play—students, parents, teachers, coaches and volunteers—to prevent and manage concussions in our kids. And there is a role for us as a government to play too.

Nous sommes déterminés à assurer la sécurité de nos enfants et à veiller à ce que chaque enfant puisse tirer parti de l'éducation de classe mondiale offerte ici en Ontario.

We're dedicated to keeping our kids safe and making sure that every kid can take advantage of the world-class education we offer here in Ontario. That is why, along with my colleagues the Ministers of Tourism, Culture and Sport and of Health and Long-Term Care, we're implementing a new strategy that will address the seriousness of concussions for students engaged in school sports and in health and physical education classes. That is why today, as part of that strategy, we are introducing legislation that, if passed, will increase public awareness of the potential severity of concussions and the need for preventing, identifying and managing them properly.

This legislation, if passed, would also require school boards to put in place policies and guidelines that are consistent with the provincial policies to be developed. For example, these policies would provide students, parents, school board employees and volunteers with information about concussion prevention, identification and management, and would address when a student suspected of having sustained a concussion should be removed from or prevented from further participating in interschool or intramural athletics or in health and physical education class. They would address when a student suspected of having sustained a concussion can return to interschool or intramural athletics, to physical health education classes or to their learning, Speaker. They'll establish clear responsibilities for those involved in interschool or intramural athletics or physical health and education classes.

As part of our strategy, we will also be looking at what tools can be provided to schools, community organizations, and provincial sport and multisport organizations to help build awareness about concussion prevention, identification and management inside and outside of schools.

We will establish a subcommittee of the Healthy Schools Working Table to provide advice on concussion prevention, identification and management in schools and examine how evidence-informed resources can be used most effectively.

We will continue to work to make Ontario schools the safest and healthiest places to learn.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to acknowledge that this legislation will build on the great work that many boards have already done, working with the Ontario Physical Health and Education Association in awareness and prevention about concussions in our schools.

La santé, le bien-être et la réussite de nos élèves sont d'une importance extrême pour nous tous. Nous voulons les aider à devenir des adultes en bonne santé.

The health, well-being and success of our students are extremely important to us all. We want to help them to grow into healthy adults and we want to do everything we can to make sure they have the best possible chance to succeed at school.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Responses?

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** I find it incredibly poignant that today we're talking about concussions, and Canada's greatest hockey player currently was cleared to play today. Meanwhile, in our gallery today, the greatest

hockey player of all time's father is here as we debate this important issue that affects not only all of our—

**Mr. John O'Toole:** Walter Gretzky.

**Ms. Lisa MacLeod:** Walter Gretzky is here, ladies and gentlemen. It's incredible to have him in the chamber, because obviously we know hockey has had its fair share of concussions. We also know that many pro athletes outside of hockey—for example, in football—have also dealt with this. But that does not mean it has not been an issue that has confronted parents, because it is happening in our schools. So it is my pleasure to join this discussion today on behalf of Tim Hudak and the Ontario PC caucus.

Head injuries and concussions have dominated many headlines in recent months in North America and particularly here in Canada of late, with many pro athletes speaking out about their struggles with recovery, including, of course, mental illness as well as suicide. That, of course, is very important. That is actually a natural reason for us to want to contemplate how we can address this issue ourselves in this Legislature and talk about ways to prevent it. And when I say “ways,” it doesn't necessarily mean it needs to be legislation. However, that is what is before us and that is what we will talk about today.

So it is important, of course, that adults who are charged with the safety of children, whether that is a coach, a trainer, a doctor, a parent, a volunteer or a teacher, are able to do their best to prevent and, if necessary, identify the trauma.

Many have heard the term “concussion” over the years and, of course, I don't think many of us were fully aware of the issues. I point to the fact that in January, the Minister of State for Amateur Sport, Bal Gosal, a newly appointed minister from Ontario who serves in the federal House, estimated that 90% of severe brain injuries were preventable if parents, coaches and kids themselves knew more about the risks. So I think that as we emerge as a society to deal with this issue and we talk about it more, we'll understand it a lot better. Information provided by his department says that more than 40% of brain injuries in children and youth between the ages of 10 and 19 who are treated in emergency departments are due to sports and recreation activities. So it is relevant to this debate. Of course, I'm citing a CBC News article of January 19, 2012.

We also know that kids who sustain concussions can usually recover quite quickly, within a week or two, without lasting health problems, by following certain precautions and taking a breather from sports. As kidshealth.org suggests, a child with an undiagnosed concussion can be at risk for brain damage and even disability.

That's exactly what an Ottawa pediatrician told me earlier today when I called Dr. Judy Van Stralen about this issue. She points out that concussions can lead to long-term brain damage, behavioural issues, attention issues and learning problems. And like Judy, we just want to make sure that when we're dealing with

legislation, it is appropriate legislation. So I look forward to reviewing the bill in full detail.

I know, for example, in my own community I had a staff member, a young person, who I talked to earlier today—and she has given me permission to use her name, Alanna Fernet—who has had multiple concussions. She is a first-year university student at the University of Guelph. I am very concerned about her health and the long-term impacts of this.

1530

I know that recently in my community in Ottawa there was an assembly in December talking about the big issues of the day and talking about the fact that concussion can lead to a number of symptoms in players, including depression and, as I mentioned, in some cases, suicide.

All this to say, Speaker, that we know that interesting things have been happening in North America and throughout the world. Right here in Canada, as I mentioned, our federal government announced in January its plans to work with major sporting organizations to fund educational programs to reduce the instances of concussions. They, in their \$1.5-million injection of funding, have approved an application to allow our friends, our parents and our coaches to help assess whether or not a child has been hit with a concussion.

Mr. Speaker, just this to say that this is a first reading of the bill. I look forward to the debate on it. There are many pressing issues we have to deal with in this assembly, and children's health of course is one.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in all chambers to move along with this bill and see where it takes us.

**The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac):** Responses?

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** This bill that has been presented today will oblige schools to develop guidelines for the prevention and management of concussions. As you may well be aware, Speaker, the legislation only applies to schools and not to community-based sports leagues.

Currently, there are voluntary guidelines already in place through the OPHEA to help elementary and secondary schools deal with concussion assessment and management. It's unclear to us, and I hope that it will become clear during debate, whether these guidelines will be strengthened and changed through the introduction of this legislation.

It's estimated there are some 27,000 children with acquired brain injury, or ABI, in Ontario's schools. A concussion is classified as a traumatic brain injury, and it is one of the most common forms of acquired brain injury. Close to 500,000 people in Ontario live with an acquired brain injury, yet reliable and up-to-date statistics on the rates of concussions in school- or community-based sports are hard to find. The studies that we've looked at provide only a patchwork knowledge, but it does point to a growing problem.

Traumatic brain injury is the number one killer and disabler of young Canadians under the age of 40. There are almost 18,000 emergency room visits and/or hos-

pitalizations for traumatic brain injury in Ontario every year. Speaker, those numbers alone talk about a very substantial issue that needs to be addressed.

Acquired brain injury is growing in prevalence and has a huge impact on the lives of those affected. For far too many Ontarians, the seriousness of a brain injury only becomes clear after a tragedy impacts someone that they know. We need to be aware that the bill being introduced today is only a small piece of the work that needs to be done. We need a comprehensive approach to prevention and management of concussions and other acquired brain injuries.

Note, Speaker, that when we look at other initiatives to deal with these sorts of health problems—anti-smoking campaigns, seat belt campaigns—there is a combination of education, of resources allocated, of legislation, of incentives. We need a full range of strategies, including education; training of coaches in vigilance and coaching methods to prevent concussions; funding and guidelines for equipment; rule changes in sports to limit danger, for instance limiting body-checking; and rules and cultural approaches to deal with over-aggression. We need that change in culture, away from winning at all costs, away from glorifying fighting and towards education of the serious nature of acquired brain injury.

Research published in the Marquette Sports Law Review talked about the current guidelines in Ontario in 2011. It said: "For the programs to be effective and to ensure that the decision made to permit a young athlete to return to play is a sound one and in the best interests of the young athlete, it is crucial that all those involved, including athletic administrators and parents, work together in a collaborative way to that end."

Speaker, we have to ask: What is going to be built into this legislation to ensure that this will happen? Will the initiative around this bill provide the resources, training and support that schools need to implement guidelines? What consequences will be imposed if schools don't follow those guidelines? How will this bill help young people and adults engaged in non-school sports? How will the bill deal with the shortage of funds for safe fields and equipment in schools?

New Democrats look forward to hearing the response to these important questions through second reading and in committee. We look forward to a full debate on this bill and hearing from all the stakeholders and Ontarians who are concerned about children and brain injury.

## PETITIONS

### RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Mr. John O'Toole:** I'm so pleased to have a position here to represent my riding of Durham effectively. This is a petition that reads as follows:

"Whereas Solray Energy Corp. has given notice of its proposal for a class 3 solar power facility known as

Epsom Solar Farm to be located" in my riding "in the township of Scugog; and

"Whereas the site is on prime farmland that has been in production for many generations; and

"Whereas we consider productive farmland to be of vital importance to farm and rural communities by providing healthy, locally grown food and ensuring the sustainability of Canada's food supply; and

"Whereas class 1 to 5 farmland and land that is zoned rural or agricultural should be protected from the current proposal and similar projects that may be considered in the future; and

"Whereas other sites of less value to agriculture"—lower classes—"are better locations for solar power developments" and, for that matter, wind;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Ontario Legislature not to allow ... industrial solar farms on prime agricultural land, and we further express our support for giving local communities, through their elected municipal councils, the power to control and approve large-scale renewable energy" projects and energy developments of all sorts.

I'm pleased to sign and support this and provide it to Marium, one of the pages here in their last week in the Legislature.

#### PUBLIC TRANSIT

**Mr. Jonah Schein:** I would like to introduce a petition today to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas the Toronto Transit Commission will have an estimated ridership of 503 million in 2012;

"Whereas the TTC received only \$91 million from the province of Ontario for operations in the 2010-11 fiscal year with a total TTC budget of \$1.5 billion;

"Whereas fare boxes account for 70% to 80% of total TTC costs, making it one of the highest fare-recovery ratios in North America;

"Whereas the TTC recommended another 10-cent fare increase to all riders again this year;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the province of Ontario pledge stable and long-term funding of the TTC and other municipally run transit authorities in Ontario and ensure that provincial funding be restored to 50% of the operating subsidy; and

"That transit authorities who accept that restored funding freeze or reduce their fares."

I agree with this petition. I will affix my name to it and give it to page Patrick.

#### WIND TURBINES

**Mr. Todd Smith:** The following comes from residents of Prince Edward county.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the proposed Gilead Power project in Prince Edward county is currently planned for an area that the municipality has designated for another purpose; and

"Whereas it's the opinion of real estate experts in Prince Edward county that the installation of the Gilead industrial wind factory will negatively impact property values and the tourism sector, which is vital to the economic success of Prince Edward county; and

"Whereas other jurisdictions have recognized that it is environmentally counterproductive to put industrial wind factories in important bird areas, such as the one that exists on the south shore of Prince Edward county; and

"Whereas that recognition was also accepted by the Senate of Canada through a unanimous resolution;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"That the public consultation period for the EBR project..., also known as the Gilead project, be extended to April 1 to allow the community sufficient time to make clear their arguments as to the negative impact that the project will have on the people, economy and ecology of Prince Edward county."

I agree with this petition and will sign it and send it to the table with page Judy.

1540

#### HYDRO RATES

**Mr. Michael Mantha:** This petition is from members from Algoma-Manitoulin.

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas Ontario taxpayers have been paying over millions in extra charges on their hydro bills to help retire the debt. The amount collected to date, as per the Auditor General's report, is \$8.7 billion, but the amount owing was \$7.8 billion;

"Whereas Ontario taxpayers are asking, "Where is the money being invested?";

"Whereas Ontario taxpayers are asking why this was not addressed at the time the debt was paid;

"Whereas electrical rates have increased with the new creation of green energy coming online to include solar and wind, refurbishment of nuclear plants and deregulation of Hydro One;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows to obtain answers to the following questions:

"How much of the debt remains?

"When will it be eliminated from Ontario taxpayers' hydro bills?"

I agree with this petition. I will affix my signature.

#### EDUCATION FUNDING

**Mr. Phil McNeely:** I have a petition here from the parents and children at Avalon Public School in Ottawa-Orléans.

"To the Legislature of Ontario:

"Whereas the current enrolment of Avalon Public School is 687 students;

"Whereas the student capacity of the school is 495 students, as determined by the Ministry of Education's own occupancy formula;

"Whereas the issue of overcrowding and lack of space makes it impossible for Avalon Public School to offer full-day kindergarten until the overcrowding issue is addressed;

"Whereas Avalon Public School is located in a high-growth community;

"Whereas the enrolment at Avalon Public School is expected to continue rising at a rate of 10% to 15% a year for the foreseeable future;

"Whereas the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board has made building a new school in Avalon a top capital priority;

"We, the undersigned, call on the province of Ontario and Ministry of Education to provide the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board with the necessary funding to build an additional school in Avalon, to open no later than September 2014."

I agree with this petition and send it forward with Rachel.

## CURRICULUM

**Mr. Steve Clark:** I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas the Ministry of Education has deemed music an essential subject in elementary schools and the ministry arts curriculum states that high-quality instruction is key to student success in arts education; and

"Whereas, according to a 2010 Coalition for Music Education study, 58% of all elementary schools in Ontario are without a qualified music teacher capable of teaching the ministry curriculum; and

"Whereas, due to classroom capping and staff cuts, school boards are unable to provide this essential subject with teachers who have the expertise to ensure student success; and

"Whereas protecting music in elementary schools would ensure children benefit from the many positive aspects of this essential subject;

"Therefore we, the undersigned, call on the Minister of Education to declare music in Ontario elementary schools a protected subject, thus ensuring teachers delivering the program are familiar with the elements of music, can read and interpret music and are able to communicate in a musical way."

I'm pleased to support this petition for my constituents. I will affix my signature and send it to the table with page Grace.

## DIAGNOSTIC SERVICES

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** It's my pleasure to present this petition from the people of the northeast, and it reads as follows:

"Whereas the Ontario government" has made PET scanning "a publicly insured health service available to cancer and cardiac patients...; and

"Whereas," since 2009, "insured PET scans" are performed "in Ottawa, London, Toronto, Hamilton and Thunder Bay; and

"Whereas the city of Greater Sudbury is a hub for health care in northeastern Ontario, with" Health Sciences North, "its regional cancer program and the Northern Ontario School of Medicine;

"We ... petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make PET scans available through" Health Sciences North, "thereby serving and providing equitable access to the" residents of the northeast.

I fully support this petition, Madam Speaker. I will affix my name to it and ask page Patrick to bring it to the Clerk.

## KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** I'm very pleased today to present a petition on behalf of Ashley McQuade, who lives on Walnut Street in the beautiful community of Omemee, Ontario.

A petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, Canada, draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to the following:

"Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada;

"Whereas real progress is being made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease, in particular the development of a bioartificial kidney;

"We, the undersigned, call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make research funding available for the explicit purpose of conducting bioartificial kidney research as an extension to the research being successfully conducted at several centres in the United States" of America.

I agree with this petition, will affix my signature to it and give it to page Shirley.

## CHRONIC JOINT PAIN

**Mr. Victor Fedeli:** We have a petition here to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"Whereas Synvisc (Hylan G-F 20) is a trademarked injected medication for the treatment of chronic osteoarthritis, hip, ankle, knee, shoulder and other joint pain approved for use in Canada; and

"Whereas this treatment is not currently insured under OHIP but it is an alternative to costly surgeries which could drive up the cost of health care expenditures for Ontario taxpayers; and

"Whereas the cost of this treatment—\$600 for three injections—is prohibitive and unaffordable for many Ontarians who suffer from chronic joint pain, thus leading to unnecessary pain and suffering;

"We, the undersigned, hereby petition the government of Ontario to include Synvisc in its list of treatments to be insured under OHIP and remove the financial burden currently faced by those who are prescribed this treatment to ease their chronic pain."

I agree with this, sign my name to the top and hand it to page William C.

### CHILD PROTECTION

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** I have this petition from the people of the northeast, and it reads as follows:

"Whereas Ontario is one of the few provinces that does not have independent oversight of child welfare administration; and

"Whereas eight provinces now have independent oversight of child welfare issues, including child protection; and

"Whereas all provincial ombudsmen first identified child protection as a priority issue in 1986, and still Ontario does not allow the Ombudsman to investigate people's complaints about children's aid societies...; and

"Whereas people wronged by CAS decisions concerning placement, access, custody or care are not allowed to appeal those decisions to the Ontario Ombudsman's office;"

They petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario "to enact legislation in support of the Ombudsman of Ontario to have the power to probe decisions and investigate complaints concerning the province's children's aid societies (CAS)."

I fully support this petition, Madam Speaker, will affix my name to it and ask my trusty page Patrick to bring it to the Clerk.

### WIND TURBINES

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Petitions? The member for Durham.

**Mr. John O'Toole:** Thank you; I'm very surprised at that honour.

A petition from my riding of Durham which reads as follows:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"Whereas there is a growing body of evidence confirming industrial wind development has serious adverse effects on host communities;

"Whereas over 135 people in Ontario have reported serious negative health effects from industrial wind development, and at least a dozen families have been bought out of their homes;

"Whereas Ontario's Green Energy Act"—it's a Liberal bill—"has ended local planning control by stripping municipal councils of their rights;

"Whereas 80 municipal councils, representing two million Ontarians, called on the government to put in place a full moratorium on industrial wind development until an independent epidemiological health study is

completed, proper environmental regulations and protections are put in place, and local democracy is restored;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"Immediately put a moratorium on all industrial wind proposals; fund an independent epidemiological health study to develop safe setbacks; legislate those findings; develop stringent environmental protection standards for natural areas; and require all projects to comply with regulations based on science" and not politics.

I'm pleased to sign and support this and give it to David, one of the pages here.

### DENTAL CARE

**M<sup>me</sup> France Gélinas:** I have this petition from the people of Sudbury and Nickel Belt, and it reads as follows:

"Whereas people need teeth to stay healthy;

"Whereas a lack of universal dental care has resulted in an epidemic of poor dental health, and many people are living and working with no teeth;

"Whereas there is only very limited support for denture care for those on social assistance and no support for the working poor;"

They call upon the Legislative Assembly of Ontario "to increase funding to assist people on social assistance and the working poor to access denture care."

I support this petition, will affix my name to it and ask page Sophia to deliver it to the Clerk.

1550

### KIDNEY DISEASE

**Mr. Jeff Leal:** Today, I have a petition from a great guy, Paul Knott, who lives at 14 Spice Street in beautiful Port Hope, Ontario. It's a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"We, the undersigned residents of Ontario, Canada, draw the attention of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to the following:

"Whereas kidney disease is a huge and growing problem in Canada;

"Whereas real progress is being made in various ways of preventing and coping with kidney disease, in particular the development of a bioartificial kidney;

"We, the undersigned, call on the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to make research funding available for the explicit purpose of conducting bioartificial kidney research as an extension to the research being successfully conducted at several centres in the United States."

I agree with this petition, will affix my signature to it and give it to page Grace.

### VISITORS

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** On a point of order: I'm sure that the Speaker would want to know that we have some

distinguished visitors from northwestern and northeastern Ontario.

We have with us Chief Sonny Gagnon; Chief Elijah Moonias from the reserve of Marten Falls; Roger Wesley, Chief of Constance Lake, along with Raymond Ferris, who's from Constance Lake but is with Nishnawbe Aski as the Ring of Fire coordinator; and Renald Beaulieu, who's the mayor of Greenstone. Leading up the back of the pack is Bobby Narcisse, but don't be kidded: He's the guy with all the power. We'd like to welcome all of you.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** While it's not a point of order, we welcome you here today.

**Mr. Gilles Bisson:** Madam Speaker, it might not have been a point of order, but it was a matter of interest.

## OPPOSITION DAY

### PUBLIC TRANSIT

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** I move that the Legislative Assembly calls upon the government of Ontario to endorse the Sheppard subway extension and honour its \$8.4-billion commitment to the city of Toronto for construction of the entire Eglinton crosstown line underground.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Mr. Hudak has moved opposition day number 2. Mr. Hudak.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Thank you, Speaker. It wasn't that long ago when the famous actor the late Peter Ustinov said of Toronto that it's like New York city, but run by the Swiss. Torontonians and Ontarians love that line. We quoted it for years. We took it as a badge of honour. It was the city that works.

For the most part, Toronto still does work, particularly for a city of its size, its diversity and its complexity. Toronto is still a great place to live, to work and to raise a family. The Ontario PC caucus says we're proud of the neighbourhoods here in Toronto and we're proud of the fact that we've managed to avoid many of the problems that plague a lot of other major urban centres, things like a hollowed-out downtown core, the flight to the suburbs and so on.

But, Speaker, I think we all agree that there's one area of our civic life here in Toronto where things have ground to a total, absolute halt—literally—and it's traffic. According to the Toronto Board of Trade, our traffic now in Toronto and the GTA—

**Mr. Rob Leone:** It's terrible.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Not only is it terrible; it's the worst in North America. According to the Toronto Board of Trade, it's even worse than the historical benchmark for gridlock: the city of Los Angeles.

Here is an important point that I hope members opposite will hear: Since it was first elected almost nine years ago, this government has spent hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars, including \$75 billion in infrastructure, and we have the worst traffic gridlock in

all of North America. We wonder where all that money went.

The problem is, there was no strategic approach to making those investments in the city of Toronto and the GTA on a strategic basis. And now, nine years later, this traffic congestion is taking an increasing toll on average women and men in Toronto and the GTA. It eats up hours of our days that could otherwise be spent at home with our loved ones. It eats up hours of our days that could otherwise be spent engaged in our studies, our jobs, our careers, our recreation. And the cost to our economy as a result of this lost time, the clogged streets, late deliveries and missed meetings is incalculable. Some have suggested it could be as high as \$6 billion annually as a rough guess.

Those watching and listening get the point. People in the city of Toronto and the GTA are spending far too much time stuck in traffic, but we haven't seen anything from the Liberals to break that. In fact, in his recent report, Gordon Chong, the head of Toronto Transit Infrastructure, calls gridlock the number one threat to Toronto's global competitiveness. Mr. Chong ought to know; he heads up the TTC's advisory body on the feasibility of expanding our subway system. And he says what we say: Build the subways. This has to happen. It's the right thing to do.

But to do it, we need a plan and we need a solid commitment from this government.

Right now, since 2008, the province of Ontario has fully \$8.4 billion on the table to fund new transit development. Again, it's been there since 2008. I think we all know this isn't a typical one third/one third/one third infrastructure program; this isn't like deciding what road to pave or what kind of bridge to paint. This is the biggest infrastructure investment in Canada and one of the biggest in all of North America. That's why we have to do it right, why this motion stands here today, and why we in the Ontario PC caucus say that to create jobs, to break gridlock here in the Toronto area, you build underground. You build subways. You don't tear up existing streets and take away lanes, which will make traffic congestion even worse.

Here's an important point that's often missed in this debate: Those \$8.4 billion that have been set aside all flow through the provincial treasury—it's not city money; it's \$8.4 billion flowing through the provincial treasury—and those dollars are flowing through Metrolinx, a provincial body created to make strategic decisions, if I follow the government's own words. It was never meant to be a lending agency simply to give out money to whatever projects were deemed appropriate at the local level, no matter how they fit in. It was quite the opposite: to actually have a regional strategic approach to break gridlock, help families spend more time together, and make Ontario and Toronto open again for investment and job creation. That's what Metrolinx is all about. It's not a lending agency. It's there to actually implement a plan. That's what's been missing. Despite the \$75 billion in total investment, gridlock is getting worse because they never had a strategic plan.

MetroLinx is a regional transit authority, and it needs clear direction from the Premier of Ontario, his cabinet and the Liberal members who live here in Toronto who aren't standing up for their own constituents in Scarborough, in Etobicoke, in north Toronto. This means, Speaker, that the approach we should take to the biggest infrastructure investment in Canada is to spend that money strategically, to make sure it fits into a plan.

The question then becomes: If this is a once-in-a-generation-or-more investment, what are we going to build? What's the right thing to do?

I used to think that we actually knew the answer, because it was back in March 2011 that the Premier signed a memorandum of understanding with Mayor Ford to build the subway line, crosstown, on Eglinton. It was signed. Mayor Ford, of course, as Madam Speaker will remember, campaigned on basically two things, stopping the gravy train and building subways in the city of Toronto, and despite having I think 40 candidates in the race or something like that, won with 47% of the vote: a clear endorsement of the subway plan. We're proud to say that we stand with the people of the city of Toronto to do the right thing and invest in subways.

1600

Premier McGuinty was actually on the right course with his MOU last March, but where does he stand today?

**Mr. John Yakabuski:** Well, he turtled.

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** Whether my colleague from Renfrew is correct, we're not absolutely sure. The Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure seemed to endorse LRTs today in question period. The Premier did not say where he stood.

But I believe, Madam Speaker, that the Eglinton crosstown line stands as the biggest infrastructure project in Canada. It's one of the biggest in North America. It is absolutely crucial that we do it right, and I believe the people in the city of Toronto, those who are following this issue, do believe that the best approach is actually to build underground. I think it's reasonable to say that the people of Toronto expect this. It was a major campaign issue. They voted for it in the last municipal election campaign.

So we are gathering today as a PC caucus and inviting members opposite to join us to say, "Let's just get on with it, do the right thing and build subways here to attract jobs and break gridlock in the city of Toronto."

*Applause.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate? Further debate?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** I'm still—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Oh, sorry. *Interjections.*

**Hon. James J. Bradley:** Further debate?

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** It's time, I say to my colleague and neighbour from St. Catharines. I just believe it's time for the Premier, and his Toronto MPPs particularly, to stand in their places today and show leadership and to say what is right for the folks in their ridings; for the city of

Toronto. I just believe the Premier should direct MetroLinx, a provincial agency flowing provincial dollars to work with the city, to build subways, not tear up existing lines.

Let me illustrate why we believe subways are the right thing to do. They are a once-in-a-generation investment that clearly offers the best return when it comes to speed, quality and value. But more than that, they are the lesson on offer from many of the world's largest and most successful urban centres that you don't permanently take out lanes on major thoroughfares with aboveground transit: LRTs, streetcars. That's exactly what the Minister of Transportation's plan that he talked about today would do. It would tear out those lanes for LRT.

Let me argue about this, Madam Speaker: So if you were to do that, if you were to follow that plan, you rip out existing lanes permanently for streetcars, LRT, what have you. You're going to make gridlock worse, you're going to cause more congestion, you're going to further depress productivity and you're going to throw up another barrier in the face of small businesses who try to make a living along these sensitive corridors.

We don't have to think that long back to that long-running mess on St. Clair West with that streetcar project. I know some of my Liberal colleagues across the way—

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Tim Hudak:** The member for St. Paul's says he loves it. That's not what I've heard; not about you, but I mean from the people of the city of Toronto. They say that St. Clair was a disaster, it was a mess. It depresses the business along that area today, and we in the PC caucus don't want to see the St. Clair disaster repeated on Finch, on Eglinton, on Sheppard. We think that will make matters worse, and that's why we stand in support of subways instead, Madam Speaker.

Here's the reality: This matter has been studied to death. Close to 40 years have gone by assessing the feasibility of extending Toronto's subway system, and the same conclusions have come up over and over again:

(1) Subways are more cost-effective in the long term. The long-term capital, operating and maintenance costs of subways are cheaper than those of light rail transit;

(2) Subways decrease congestion and commuter time. Light rail transit, by taking out existing lanes, has the opposite effect by narrowing traffic. They actually increase congestion;

(3) Subways have a smaller environmental impact. Light rail taking out existing lanes will increase gridlock, which will cause greater tailpipe pollution; and

(4) Subways accommodate long-term ridership growth, unlike glorified streetcars.

Those are the facts. That's where we stand, and they don't leave a lot of room for sentimentality. I know a lot of people feel strongly about streetcars in this city. They have been part of our urban landscape for 100 years, but it isn't the 20th century; it's the 21st century—it's 2012. Our streets are jammed, and it just makes no sense what-

soever to permanently take even more car lanes away to build yet more street-level transit.

So the purpose of our motion here today is to bring some clarity at last to the position of the Premier and his government on this issue critical to the success of the city of Toronto and the GTA, on the need to build subways.

I'll say it over and over again, Madam Speaker: World-class cities build subways. They build underground. They don't rip up streets. They don't make congestion worse.

We believe that Toronto's reputation can be built even stronger. We believe it is a great place to live, to invest and to create jobs. We want their support on our motion here today to make sure that Toronto continues to grow, continues to prosper, to bring back jobs and to break gridlock in the city of Toronto. I invite you to share in support of our motion here today.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Mr. Peter Tabuns:** I have to say, that is one of the most extraordinary speeches I've ever heard from a Conservative, and it's my hope that the Leader of the Opposition will retain that speech writer, because to those who oppose his policies, that is the best exhibit I've ever seen for the false premise that Conservative economics is built on.

Madam Speaker, I was around on Toronto city council when Mr. Mike Harris visited his tender mercies on our city. Prior to the Harris attack on the city of Toronto, we did have New York run by the Swiss, but the huge transfer of financial resources out of the city crippled Toronto.

The approach to the city of Toronto, destroying local autonomy, demoralized the city, and now, today, we have a proposal from a party that speaks endlessly about cost-effectiveness but has not looked at the cost of building and operating subways in a city that has low density throughout the inner suburbs and then into the outer suburbs.

The current Sheppard subway costs about \$8 in subsidy per ride for every rider. So, you pay \$3; the city of Toronto has to put in another \$8—11 bucks per ride. Is that cost-effective?

Madam Speaker, I would argue that, based on those economics continuing, the building of all those subsidies would cripple the Toronto Transit Commission and its ability to run its buses, its streetcars and its subways in other parts of Toronto.

I find it extraordinary that the Leader of the Opposition has not actually looked at the real costs and the real experience in this city with transit. If you look at the history of building subway and transit in Toronto, the old centre of the city had enough density, and still has enough density, to support extensive streetcar systems that came to their carrying capacity, and when they came to that carrying capacity, there was enough density to pay for the construction and operation of a subway system.

The inner suburbs—North York, Scarborough, Etobicoke—were built at a density that didn't support transit—

still don't. If you're going to actually run transit there, you have to invest in more than transit; you have to invest in the intensification of those urban areas.

We have sprawl in the GTA, we have density outside the 416, that is equivalent to Los Angeles or lower. That means the cost of subsidizing transit is extraordinary. If you're going to cost-effectively provide the people of Toronto with transit in a timeline that will make sense to most people's lives, get moving on light rail, get it on the ground and get people into those light-rail trains so they can get around this city at a cost that Toronto and the province have a better chance of being able to carry, and in a timeline that will make a difference to those who spend a big part of their lives stuck in traffic today.

1610

Speaker, if we were to proceed with this resolution and we were to put in place subways that didn't have the provincial subsidy needed for operation—and there's no suggestion of a provincial subsidy for operation—the Jane bus, which already at rush hour is so packed that bus after bus after bus passes transit stops without people being able to get on, would become even worse. For my constituents who work downtown, who try to get on the King streetcar at rush hour—passed by streetcar after streetcar after streetcar that is packed. Frankly, if, in fact, we went forward and made sure that even more money was drained out of the surface transit in this city, it would be impossible to get on the Queen streetcar.

Speaker, what has been put before us today is a proposal that has been championed by a mayor who has now lost the confidence of his council; who cannot deliver the votes of his council. And the last time I looked, legally in Ontario, council is supreme. Council is supreme.

I have to say to you, Speaker, that in the city of Toronto, people want rapid transit. They want it now. They want it at a price they can afford. This resolution doesn't give them what they want. It doesn't give them what they need. It should be, it must be, defeated.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Mr. Mike Colle:** This is rich. Incredible: It's like finding a subway on the road to Damascus or something.

I sat here in this House when the Conservatives and Mr. Hudak—you were here, Madam Speaker—killed subways. They had already started building the Eglinton subway and spent the \$100 million over two years, digging it all up—some of the Tory backbenchers weren't here. For two years, you paid to dig it up, building the station at Eglinton West. Mike Harris and Tim Hudak get elected, and what do they do? They say, "Subways are no good. We're cancelling the Eglinton subway."

Now, to hear Mr. Hudak here now, today, talk about, "Subways are the next best thing since sliced bread. It's a golden opportunity and they do everything"—in 1995, he was holding Harris's shovel as they were filling in the hole again. That's what he was doing, saying, "We can't use subways. Subways are no good. It's a waste of money."

You know, the interesting thing was that we could have built that subway—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Order.

**Mr. Mike Colle:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

We could have built that subway to the airport for \$800 million.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Order.

**Mr. Mike Colle:** They don't want to hear the truth, Madam Speaker. Eight hundred million dollars it would have cost in 1995 to build a subway, a full subway to the airport along Eglinton. Now we're talking about \$8 billion to build transit on Eglinton. If we had built it in 1995, we would have gotten rid of the congestion, the congestion Mr. Hudak is so concerned about today. If he had paid attention to the people of Toronto in 1995—they were right. The people of Toronto said, "Build transit. It creates jobs. It cleans the air. It gets rid of congestion." No, they didn't listen.

There was no debate in this House about cancelling the subways in 1995; not one minute of debate. It was a unilateral decision—probably the worst transit decision made in the history of public transit in North America—in 1995.

Now the guys who made that decision in 1995 are saying, "Oh, we support this plan"—whatever it is. And you know, this plan—the member from Trinity-Spadina knows—is a Ponzi scheme. It's a Ponzi scheme, because—do you know what he says in the motion, Madam Speaker? Do you know what he says? He says to build the Eglinton LRT completely underground and build the Sheppard subway.

Madam Speaker, what the motion doesn't mention here is that—Mr. Hudak's resolution doesn't mention that you need another \$7 billion to build the Sheppard and to bury Eglinton from Laird to Kennedy and from Black Creek to Jane. Where is he going to get the other \$7 billion? It's not in here.

Does he support—

**Mr. Bas Balkissoon:** And he said, "Don't ask his friends from Ottawa."

**Mr. Mike Colle:** And his friends at city—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Order.

**Mr. Mike Colle:** The few friends at city—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** I'm going to ask you to refrain.

**Mr. Mike Colle:** Anyway, Madam Speaker, just in conclusion: This is a phony plan. It is not a plan; it's written on the back of a napkin. This is the party that destroyed transit in Toronto. Never mind that he talks about Toronto being world-class, New York run by the Swiss; in 1995, the Tories tried to turn it into New Jersey run by Neanderthals, and they almost did it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** I want to start by saying, Madam Speaker, that a vision without action is a daydream, an action without vision is a nightmare, and the past eight years of Dalton McGuinty's government have been a nightmare.

The transit vision for Toronto—indeed, the transit dream for the GTA and even the GTHA currently—is only a daydream. The action apparently desired by some—building surface transit on rails—in an area like this one, in a climate like this one—well, that's also a nightmare.

Today, we must speak of a daydream that can and must become a reality, and for that we need a plan and we need action. Subway construction for Toronto, for the GTA, is decades behind. For Toronto to be the world-class city that we all know it can be, we urgently need to catch up. We have to build subways. We have to connect people, we have to connect businesses and we have to do so in a regional context.

We can erase the sins of the past. We can build a greater Toronto and Hamilton area. We can make sure it is a world-class metropolitan area for the next 100 years. I call on every member of this House to vote his or her conscience today and drop the partisanship. So many have missed this opportunity before. Residents in Toronto are tired of city streets being ripped up, and they want the higher-quality service that subway transportation provides: faster trips, bigger passenger cars, and an underground transit system that brings Toronto to the level of a Paris, a Tokyo, a London, a New York, a Chicago, a Boston.

Those who promote light rail as a model for transit forget that the jurisdictions where light rail proves effective over the long term are, by way of example, Portland, Oregon, a northwest city where it barely snows and where fewer than 600,000 people make their home. Building light rail is the advice of convenience. We cannot afford to listen to that advice. We cannot miss a crucial opportunity.

Just 18 months ago, Rob Ford asked people what they wanted, and they said, "Stop the runaway spending and focus on underground transit." Who cares what people think of Rob Ford in the long term? They're thinking about their welfare and the welfare of their children and of their children's children. As elected members, we all have a responsibility to listen to that message, a responsibility that is more than catering to re-election prospects, as some councillors seem to be doing in their wards. They think about what will happen to them in 30 months instead of what will happen to the region in 30 years. In 30 years, the GTA and the GTHA region, in that time frame, will be home to eight million people—less than 30 years. We have a responsibility to plan for that future now. It will be too late to prepare for that growth in 30 years.

Do you know what the most ready-to-go subway extension is, Speaker? It's the Yonge Street extension north from Finch to Highway 7 through my riding, because real people there want it and real people need it. Why doesn't it get built? Too many jurisdictions, silos.

1620

What similar urban area has so many transit companies? The answer is, none. York Region Transit, TTC, GO, Mississauga Transit, Durham transit—how many different and duplicative organizations do you need to serve one area this size? The answer, ultimately, is one, and I plan to do my best, with my party, to get us to that point, Speaker.

But it all has to begin somewhere: pieces of a long-term vision that must be doing what the people—the people, Speaker—in their numbers want in Toronto, in the GTA, in the GTAH. People who have to travel long distances every single day from Scarborough, from North York, from Etobicoke—and I'm not even mentioning Markham and Vaughan and Richmond Hill and Mississauga and Brampton—frankly, they're tired of being held hostage by Toronto city council.

It starts here, and it starts now—not some above-ground system where people freeze in the winter and wait while snow is removed from a track or where neighbourhoods are ripped in half like St. Clair and Spadina. The province has to honour its \$8.4-billion commitment to the city of Toronto for construction of the Eglinton crosstown line and to endorse the Sheppard subway extension. Research shows that in excess of 60% in the affected areas I named want the subways.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Peter Shurman:** Our job, your job, member from Eglinton—Lawrence, is to make that happen, and we can do that.

My party is clear: We want expanded transit to clear gridlock. We want the province to step up; we want them to do it now and act expeditiously.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I want to quote a politician who, in taking credit for a trans-jurisdictional subway jump from Toronto into York region, said, "The McGuinty Liberals have committed funding to the people of the GTA for the York subway expansion because we know that it will play a vital role in helping to lessen the problems associated with gridlock, help commuters, students and others to get to where they need to go quicker...." That was said on April 12, 2007, by Brad Duguid in Ontario Hansard.

There are many more people to quote but no more time for me to speak today or for the people of this city and this region to wait, Madam Speaker.

Let us vote in solidarity. Let's get on with the future. Let's expand underground transit as quickly as we can and move on.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Mr. Jonah Schein:** I'd like to welcome friends I notice up in the gallery, friends who actually live in the city of Toronto, who take public transit. I welcome them here.

I would like to encourage folks across the province to actually come down to Queen's Park. One thing that has been inspiring in recent months has been that Torontonians have actually come into city hall. They've come and

they've spoken to the folks who represent them, and I think that it has brought a degree of common sense to city hall. In fact, it has helped city hall come up with a transit plan that works for the city, that brings public transit to all corners of the city. I'd like to bring that kind of spirit—grassroots, common sense—into this building here. So I encourage you to bear with it, friends, and stay here with us. This building can seem inaccessible, but we need you here.

Transit has hit a nerve in this city, and I think that's why we're talking about it today. I think it has been very polarizing. I don't think it has to be quite as polarizing as it has become. It shouldn't be about "subways or streetcars." I wish that the debate would be a bit more informed. We're not talking about building more streetcars in this city; we're talking about building a light rail plan in this city, and I can show you pictures of what that will look like. It won't look anything like streetcars.

Transit has touched a nerve because it speaks to our health; it speaks to our environmental concerns; it speaks to issues of equity. There are folks in this city who actually just cannot access the city. If you look at the way that wealth disparity is spread out across the city, the further you are from good transit, the less money you have and the less the city becomes accessible to you.

As we heard from the opposition, as well, it is a matter of prosperity and economic development. We are stuck in traffic in this city, and we all owe it to each other to get down to work and get this city moving. We are losing billions of dollars every year in this city.

We should know that the NDP always stands up for public transit—consistently stands up for public transit. We did start to build a subway line back in the day here—and it's hard to be lectured to about fiscal conservatism when you can spend that much money burying a transit plan; filling in a hole.

But the government itself has waffled on this too. We've supported the light rail plan in this city since its beginning. It was a well thought-out, a well-studied plan. It had widespread approval—and it had a lot more funding at one point, too. But the Liberals, after supporting this plan, then went ahead and cut \$4 billion from the transit plan; \$4 billion that we could have used to get people to the airport, for example. Instead, in my community in Davenport, the only access to the airport is going to be a diesel train: a diesel train that only the most affluent folks will be able to access. Instead of paying \$3 for a fare, it will cost \$30.

Anyway, so folks always say that the mayor says he wants subways. You know what? I hear from riders—and I am a transit rider. I take the TTC every day. People just want to get to work on time. Right? I hear it from folks here: They want monorails. I have young friends who said they want jet packs. We want a transit system that works for this city, and we can't talk in fantasy at this point. We cannot talk in fantasy at this point, because the \$8.4 billion that's on the table, if we use it all to put in—and it's not going to be a subway, folks. Even what you're asking for is not a subway; it's a light rail system that

you're asking for. It's not a subway. If we put that all underground on Eglinton, that will be the only project that we have funding for. So what's important to me is that we actually build a project that funds the entire city.

I do think we need to respect council in this case, and council has made a decision. They have lost the support of the mayor because he simply did not have a plan that stood the smell test. It did not deliver public transit to all corners of the city.

But you know, what concerned me is a lack of leadership from the province. I'm proud to be with the NDP. I'm proud that during the campaign we were the only party to talk about public transit. We're concerned about how you operate this system, going forward. We used to have 50% of the operating costs. We used to subsidize operating costs 50%, and it's down to 18% now. Since we've lost that subsidy, friend, costs have gone up. It costs more to ride the subway than it ever did, and we're losing routes all the time. So this is a provincial issue, but we need to respect the wish of council, who can plan the city.

Last week, we heard from our friend here from Timiskaming-Cochrane. He was talking about respect for the north and he was talking about how the north has a particular knowledge of its community. It would be disrespectful for me, I think, to weigh into my colleague's knowledge, right? To tell him how to run his farm and community, right? And I have to say that I'm not sure why we have a whole caucus over here with not a single seat in Toronto who's going to come and tell citizens of Toronto how to run a transit program.

So I would invite you to come and ride transit with me.

**Mr. Mike Colle:** Come and ride the Dufferin bus.

**Mr. Jonah Schein:** Come and ride the Dufferin bus.

But Speaker, that goes for all members here. Back in December, a group from Rexdale, who spends hours every day just trying to access the city, challenged city councillors to ride transit for a week; they challenged MPPs to ride transit for a week; and I was ashamed it was only the NDP caucus, only Toronto members from the NDP caucus, who would actually accept that challenge and ride transit. And I would challenge the rest of you: Get on the subway. Get on the streetcar and see how this place works, okay?

We're sick of politics. What we need to do is get down to the real business of getting this city moving again.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member from Scarborough—Agincourt.

**Ms. Soo Wong:** This government's position has been very clear: We have committed \$8.4 billion to invest in transit in the city of Toronto. We must respect the will of this Toronto city council, its rights and responsibilities in making decisions on city transit plans.

This government has a proven record in investing in transit. Since 2003, we've invested more than \$3.8 billion to improve or expand transit in the city of Toronto. In investing in transit, we have moved forward in partnership with the city of Toronto. A vote for the opposition

leader's motion would override Toronto city council's decision-making process. As the city still needs to discuss and vote on the expert panel's report on the Sheppard corridor, it is reckless and premature of the opposition to jump to the conclusion before city council has reached its decision. This motion shows the opposition's fundamental disrespect for Toronto city council as a legitimate, democratic and legal order of government.

**1630**

Voting against this motion is not a vote against subways. We realize that there are benefits to underground transit, and nobody is suggesting that subways are not a great form of transportation. In fact, many of my constituents have told me they would like to have a subway. But this decision is up to Toronto city council to make, and I continue to let my constituents know that they must let their concerns be known to council.

If we are to move forward in improving transit in the city of Toronto, we must do so in partnership with the city. Part of that means we must respect its will and its decision-making process. The opposition leader's motion disregards this reality, and that is why I am not supporting this motion, Madam Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Mr. Steve Clark:** This is a very important debate in this House, regardless of what riding you represent. Coming from rural eastern Ontario, I have to say, Speaker, that sometimes there's not a lot of love for Toronto. We tend to use this wonderful city as a scapegoat for a lot of things that drive us crazy. In my riding, you don't get a lot of votes talking about Toronto in downtown Athens or Mallorytown or Westport, but I think that's in large part not to the city but to this government. In our heart of hearts, all of us recognize how important this community is to the ultimate success of the province, even if some of us may not want to admit it.

So, Speaker, it should concern us all when Mayor Ford, who was elected in large part for his commitment to end gridlock on city streets by building subways to move people, should have his plans bogged down by political gridlock at city hall. Let's remember that the province has a very large stake in this debate at Toronto city hall, which is clearly being driven more by ideology than what's best for transit.

We committed, across the way, to \$8.4 billion in transit development in the city and it's incumbent upon us, as stewards of the public purse, to ensure that we're getting the best bang for our buck. We have a responsibility to show some leadership and demonstrate our support for subways as the best fix for Toronto transit problems plaguing the city today. Our leader, Tim Hudak, is attempting to do this with his motion. We're simply calling on the government to do the right thing: to endorse the Sheppard subway extension and honour the commitment to construct the entire Eglinton crosstown line underground.

I want to turn people's attention—I want to re-quote. I know our leader quoted Dr. Gordon Chong, who noted,

among other things, that if we want to get people out of their cars and onto public transit, subways are the only option that will do that. Given the choice between light rail and their cars, people are going to stay behind the wheel, and that's one of the main reasons why light rail simply doesn't deliver to commuters the travel time savings that a subway will.

The TTC's own estimates, Speaker, show that an underground trip from Laird Avenue to Kennedy station would take 14 minutes. By light rail, the travel time is nearly double, at 24 minutes, only slightly better than a bus at 28 minutes.

Speaker, why would the province invest so many tax dollars and cause so much traffic chaos—disrupt business, basically—to make a travel time that isn't much better than a bus? It just doesn't make any sense to build a system that's so slow, drivers are going to opt to stay behind the wheel.

I think it's important, too, that when we talk about the cost of light rail versus subways, we don't lose sight of the long-term operating costs. Subways cause less disruption to traffic and businesses during construction, are almost twice as fast as light rail, and are the only true option if rapid transit is your goal. They're the most proven way to get people onto public transit, and they cost less to operate in the long run, as the Leader of the Opposition talked about today.

This is an important debate. It's a once-in-a-lifetime investment in infrastructure, and as a major partner in this endeavour, the provincial government has more than the authority to speak clearly in favour of constructing subways. Quite frankly, Speaker, I think they have an obligation to do so. To remain silent and to allow the clear will of voters in the last provincial election—who supported the plan for the subway—to be shoved aside for those whose only agenda is to frustrate Mayor Ford at any cost would be irresponsible for us here in the Legislature.

As our critic, I feel—I want to urge the government to support this legislation. I think you're going to do the right thing and vote for Tim Hudak this afternoon.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for Trinity-Spadina.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** I have to declare something: I really like subways. I always did. And I want to say to the Leader of the Opposition and to so many other friends, from Simcoe-Grey, Kitchener-Waterloo, Wellington-Halton Hills, Oxford, Parry Sound-Muskoka, Durham and Newmarket-Aurora: You guys are 18 years too late.

But I want to say, I love the arguments the Leader of the Opposition has made today. I support all of you fine Tories today for all the good arguments you've been making on subways. Except for someone like me who was there in the 1990s, when you guys filled those subways on Eglinton—and I know the member from Eglinton said \$100 million, but I think you guys spent \$160 million to fill the holes.

I just wonder where my good friend Tim Hudak, the Leader of the Opposition, was that day and what he

might have said, because I know he came in 1995; he wasn't there in the 1990s. But in the 1990s, I would have loved to have heard those arguments that the Leader of the Opposition would have made then. I would have loved to have been part of that discussion, because I'm assuming the arguments he made today, he made then, and that clearly he was shunned by his caucus and that clearly all the other members I listed were also shunned by Mike Harris and the other new guy. I could be wrong. I don't know.

But I love the arguments. The Leader of the Opposition listed five, and they all make good sense. And then I tried to figure this out. I say, "Okay, they loved the Drummond report"—they love it. There are some things they don't want to cut, to be sure, but there are many other things they would cut. The Drummond report isn't enough by way of cuts. They want to do more. "Okay," I say to myself, "that's interesting. But they now want to build subways."

We have a deficit. Under them, we wouldn't have a deficit, because they would cut severely. Under them, they wouldn't give any subsidies to anyone who is creating jobs, although we want guarantees from the Liberal government with respect to job guarantees and we're not getting them. This is true. But I want to say that if you really believe in subways, make a strong commitment that you will deliver on the money should, God forbid you ever get elected. Make a commitment that the money will be there, and tell us where you are going to get the money, because I don't see it.

For years, we had a plan from then-Mayor Miller. And understand this: It takes four or five years to even think of a plan, to agree on a plan, then it takes another four or five years to even get the shovels in the ground. And through the Miller administration, they probably spent \$160 million or more just to do the preparatory work for his idea, supported by council. Then Rob Ford comes along. No, he's got a better idea: "Scrap that plan. Scrap all of the investments. We've got a new one: We want to build subways." This is the guy who loves cars. He loves cars. There won't be a war on cars, not under Ford. But he had a plan: the subways.

Now, we slowed down the other plan, we put it aside, then sanity prevailed at city council. They're taking control—God bless. So some sanity has been restored, and we hopefully will have a plan so we can get the shovel in the ground.

Now, I say to the Tories: I would love to build subways; I really would. This is not a war of subways versus LRT. It isn't. We are building subways and we are building LRT. At the moment, we just don't have the commitment from the federal Conservatives—God bless them—to build subways. There is no commitment. We do not have the money, because the revenue side is not there. And rather than talking about where we're going to get the money, both political parties are talking about how much we're going to cut in the next little while. There isn't the money. The Sheppard subway line is simply too expensive to build. Developers don't want to

build unless you give them a whole lot of money to do it. The money is not there for the subway line, and the people are not there for the subway line on Sheppard.

So while you make good arguments—

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** Build it and they will come.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** No, they didn't go to North York. They thought that the folks would rush to North York, because they predicted 60,000 people would be there. Only 12,000 ended up travelling up in those areas. The point is the folks are not there; the money is not there. I just want you to be a little honest—not too much, God forbid. But, just a little bit of honesty, please.

1640

Let's build subways if you put up the money. If you don't have the money and you're not committing to how you're going to raise that money, please, let's be sensible. Mercifully, Toronto city council has found a balanced approach and has found sanity once and for all, so I'm hoping that we're going to move on the right path.

Today's motion: I will not be supporting it. It's not sane, it's not honest, and it's a bit pandering to some of Mayor Ford's supporters out there. Maybe you might get some. I don't know. But I will not be supporting it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Mr. Mario Sergio:** While the Leader of the Opposition was speaking and promoting the wonderful side of building subways, I couldn't help but look into the gallery behind me here. It was kind of interesting because I saw a gentleman going, "No way," and then saw another one saying, "Yes." It was completely split, according to the views of the Leader of the Opposition.

Let me say this, Madam Speaker: The motion is totally coming here in a way that is way too early. I think you should have waited maybe until the March 21 results from city council. Then maybe you could have come to this House and said, "Now that the legitimate council of the city of Toronto has voted in support, in a majority way, for subways"—because we have three lines here, not one—then it would have been much better at the time to come and say, "Are you putting the money on the table?" The money is on the table. We never said no. But the fact is that we don't have direction from an elected, legal, legitimate council, democratically elected by the people. This is the only thing that we want; this is the only thing that we expect. I would say that the Leader of the Opposition would respect the decision of the council elected democratically in the city of Toronto.

You know, since 1979, I have been working and fighting to get the subway extension to York University, which, by the way—my friend from Davenport was not here—the NDP did not support.

I love subways. I think they are another wonderful mode of transportation. But this is not what this city of Toronto is asking us to do. When we put the \$8.4 billion on the table, we didn't say, "This is for the Finch subway, the Sheppard subway or the Eglinton subway." It is for improvements to Toronto transportation, but we have to have a direction. Unless we do that, I think that we

should go and respect the decision that they have made, I believe, two or three weeks ago. Now that they approved having this particular panel that is going to deliver on March 21, let's wait, see what they say and then we'll come back and talk more about it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Mr. Monte McNaughton:** It's kind of ironic to have heard the speakers here today, apart from the member from Scarborough—Agincourt, but all of the other speakers actually have subways running through their ridings, so quite brave of them to stand up.

Also, I would like to say, it's fitting to be speaking today as well to this issue and to this motion because today is Toronto's 178th birthday, so, great to be speaking today.

The issue of the TTC and the failure to move forward on this project is something that is of great concern to myself, my fellow PC caucus members, our leader, Tim Hudak, and, most importantly, to the people of Toronto and throughout the GTA. We actually heard today from Gary Yeung, the spokesperson for SubwaysTO, and he said clearly this, Speaker: "Subways TO stands behind Tim Hudak's motion and Torontonians' preference to create real rapid transit in this city, by finishing the Sheppard subway and building Eglinton underground to Scarborough."

If we want Toronto to be the world-class city it can be, to help drive the economic indicators and create jobs and growth in Ontario, then Toronto needs to build subways. Truly world-class cities build underground, not on street level. World-class cities have learned to avoid permanently taking out entire lanes with above-ground transit, further snarling traffic and harming productivity, commerce, and quality of life—world-class cities like Madrid, Hong Kong, London, Paris and New York.

The sooner we can get clarity from Dalton McGuinty and his Liberal government, get this project under way and get the shovels into the ground, the sooner the residents of Toronto, Scarborough and the entire GTA can begin to reap the rewards and benefits that additional subway lines will bring. The potential rewards are great: things like increased productivity, reduced gridlock, reduced traffic emissions and, importantly, more jobs, development and economic growth for the city of Toronto and for the entire province of Ontario.

Speaker, the city of Toronto estimates that these projects will create 100,000 new jobs—100,000 new jobs—this, when we have a Dalton McGuinty jobs crisis in Ontario, with more than 600,000 men and women unemployed. We know that Toronto gridlock costs our economy over \$6 billion each year and that gridlock is the number one threat to Toronto's competitiveness. We also know that time spent behind the wheel is time spent away from your family, away from your children and away from your community.

Our motion here today calls on the Dalton McGuinty Liberals to push forward with plans to address traffic congestion in the city of Toronto by building under-

ground transit. I am pleased to support this motion. I am asking all MPPs on the government side to stand up for Toronto and for the greater good of the province and make Toronto a world-class city. Support Tim Hudak and our PC motion here today.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** You know, there are times in this House where you have to laugh because otherwise you would cry. This perhaps is one of those times. I mean, here we have to my right, both literally and figuratively, a party—not one member of which, by the way, comes from Toronto—that purports to speak for Toronto and has hitched its wagon to Rob Ford, who, in my memory, is the most unpopular mayor ever in the city of Toronto, whose own council is rising up against him. At the very least of it, I don't get the strategy behind it.

But let's talk about the reality and the ethics of it. I took the challenge. I travelled on the TTC for that week. I can tell you that I got on the Queen streetcar to come to work and then the subway to get to work from there. If I travelled on the TTC every day to get to all of my appointments within Toronto, I figured I would add one whole day to my week in terms of time. This is absolutely unacceptable.

I want to quote my friend from Trinity-Spadina: This isn't a war between LRT and subways. Lord knows, some of us have been to London and New York. I would love to have the London public transit system and get on the subway and get off and travel everywhere. I've met MPs in London, England, who never drove anywhere. They didn't have to—it would be insane to; ditto New York.

But the cost for such a venture is in the billions. I would happily vote for my friend's motion over here if the federal government, which last time I checked was a Conservative government, stepped up and paid for this, or if, again, the Progressive Conservatives in Ontario brought forward a budget that actually would put in something in the order of \$15 billion to pay for it too. So that's them.

But wait; it doesn't stop there. It doesn't stop there; it gets even weirder—surreal, one could say—in this House, because my friends across the aisle, they yanked \$4 billion out of the transit city plan before Rob Ford was ever elected. Had that money gone forward, maybe we wouldn't be having this conversation. Maybe the proverbial shovel would be in the ground and we'd have some transit.

1650

My friends across the way know full well that we used to fund 50% of Toronto's transit operating budget, and now it's only 18%. You can't run a transit system on property taxes. No city does that. Why should we expect this city to do that? That's what they are purporting.

Here we have two parties, both guilty of inaction on the transit file; guilty as charged, and we members who actually live and work in Toronto are stuck in our cars because there's simply no other way. That is criminal.

That's criminal to the environment. It's criminal to those low-income folks who need to take transit, who cannot afford the transit as it is, and watch car after car on Queen Street go by full. I see them in the morning. My goodness, we're going to have to start shuttling them in our own cars soon because they'll never get on.

We are at an impasse, and yet, miracle of miracles, Toronto city council rose up, Madam Speaker; they rose up against the most unpopular mayor in the world; and they actually decided, with some degree of sanity, to go moving ahead with what they've got and with what they can accomplish. I say: My goodness, anything is better than nothing, and this is anything.

Now, would it be better if they would ante up their fair share? Would it be better if the federal Conservatives would ante up their fair share, because the federal Conservatives are equally guilty of not investing in this city—in terms of all of our cities—in transit. The Liberals provincially are guilty of not investing in our transit system. I say, Madam Speaker, to quote Shakespeare: "A pox on both their houses."

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate. The member from Scarborough Southwest.

**Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Before you begin—order. Order.

The member from Scarborough Southwest.

**Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti:** For over 23 years, I've had the honour and privilege to serve the people of Scarborough, first as their city councillor and now as their member of provincial Parliament. I have always stood firmly in support of the wishes of the vast majority of my constituents who support the underground transit option for Scarborough. This is the plan that we believe will most effectively work to reduce gridlock, improve air quality and help build a stronger community here in Scarborough.

However, since the signing of a memorandum of understanding, or an MOU, between our Premier, Metrolinx and the mayor of Toronto, our government has honoured its commitment to fund the expansion of rapid transit into Scarborough along Eglinton Avenue.

It is in this context that the Leader of the Opposition's motion contains so much irony, when one considers that he was part of the last Conservative government that actually cancelled the Eglinton line after construction had already started in 1995. Had his government not done this, there would be no need for any debate here today.

Last year's memorandum of understanding called upon the province, Metrolinx and the city of Toronto to seek approval from the province, the Metrolinx board and Toronto city council respectively. The first two obtained their approval; the city did not. Toronto city council has since voted to move to an above-ground option for part of the Eglinton line.

The Leader of the Opposition's motion maintains that the will of Toronto city council should be ignored. Let

me be clear: I fully support the below-ground option, but I also fundamentally believe that the will of democracy is that elected institutions must be respected. We will maintain our strong commitment to public transit for Scarborough and for municipalities across Ontario.

Today's motion, as well as the events at Toronto city council, confirm that the time has come to stop moving agendas and start moving people.

I want to end with this one question: Since when does an opposition party with no representatives from Toronto decide what is best for Toronto? Shame on you.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Order. Order. Further debate?

**Mr. John Yakubuski:** I'm not a member from Toronto, and we don't have any members in the city of Toronto, but I will say to the member for Scarborough Southwest, based on that speech and if that's the way he believes and he believes in not representing his constituents and in taking his orders from the Premier, there's likely going to be a few less members from that party in Toronto after the next election.

As I said, Madam Speaker, let's be clear: I am not from the city of Toronto, but I've had the honour of being a member in this Legislature—I'm in my ninth year now. And I've spent my entire life—my father was a member here before. I know the city of Toronto a little bit, as much as someone who comes from rural eastern Ontario possibly could.

But I'll tell you what I want. I'm in this debate because I want Toronto to continue to be the world-class city it is, it should be and it can be. But if it's going to be a world-class city in the 21st century, it has to stop thinking like the 19th century. It has to start realizing that if you want to move ahead, you've got to use the best technology and the best form of transportation possible. The reality is that a subway is the most efficient, long-term, cost-effective and environmentally friendly way of transporting mass numbers of people.

How are you going to talk about efficiency in transit when you put more streetcar lines on the streets of Toronto and you've got more gridlock and cars stopped, going nowhere, because they cannot move?

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** It doesn't make sense.

**Mr. John Yakubuski:** It makes no sense. You put your transportation infrastructure under the ground and you move the most number of people most efficiently. This is about the future of Toronto, this is about the future of Ontario, this is about the future of Canada, because this is our biggest city, it is the engine of Canada, and we can't be going backwards in the way that we design a transit system.

I say to the Minister of Infrastructure, I say to the member from Scarborough Southwest, the members from Etobicoke—

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** Economic development.

**Mr. John Yakubuski:** The Minister of Economic Development; I'm sorry.

**Mr. Robert Bailey:** As well.

**Mr. John Yakubuski:** As well—used to be infrastructure. If you really believe in what your constituents are telling you—and if you don't, maybe you'd better spend more time in your communities and start talking to them, because they want to be able to move in this city in the most efficient, cost-effective, environmentally friendly way. The subway is the way to go. If you believe in Toronto, the future of Toronto, you will support this resolution.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Mrs. Laura Albanese:** I'd like to be very frank. I'm a big supporter of the Eglinton crosstown line and I've been clear and consistent in supporting an underground Eglinton crosstown line since the beginning, since the inception of the original transit plan, in particular for the west portion of the project in the riding of York South-Weston.

This area would be subject to the highest number of expropriations on the entire line if it were to be built above ground, so area residents and I were therefore heartened by the fact that a new memorandum of understanding foresaw an environmental assessment that would have looked at extending the line underground till Jane Street. Whether it's subways or LRTs, the majority of my residents support underground transit—whether it's subways or LRTs. This motion, in my opinion, is therefore not—

*Interjections.*

1700

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Just a moment, please. It's impossible to hear from one end of the chamber to the other. I'd ask the members to have their conversations outside the chamber or listen to the speech.

The member has the floor.

**Mrs. Laura Albanese:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I think we all realize the benefits of underground transit, and I don't think that anyone in here is against subways, but I think that a world-class city needs a variety of options, not just one in particular.

In my riding of York South-Weston, as it was pointed out earlier, we have been waiting for a subway to arrive since the 1990s, and that's ever since the Conservative government of the day filled the hole with dirt and cancelled the Eglinton West subway extension. Now the shovels are in the ground again, so we need to move forward.

The motion before us today links the Eglinton crosstown and the Sheppard line. As far as I'm concerned, the Sheppard line—and for the Sheppard line, I consider this motion to be premature, first of all because city council has not yet received the results of the report that is due on March 21.

I also think that we need to point out—it's a point that needs to be made—a financial plan to finance these projects is not on the table and does not exist at this point in time. The resolution doesn't account for billions of dollars. We have put \$8.4 billion on the table, but for this

motion, over \$7 billion is missing, and that needs to be said, Madam Speaker. We have to be honest with our residents and with taxpayers.

My hope is that we will continue to work to find resources that would allow us to go forward and get transit expansion built here in Toronto.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Mr. Frank Klees:** Speaker, I'm pleased to rise to address this motion before us. I believe that this motion is really about leadership. I believe that what has been missing on the discussion about infrastructure development, and especially transit, for many years now in this province, is leadership. We continue to allow infrastructure projects and transit projects to be partisan and political footballs. Unfortunately, what has happened here is exactly that, once again.

There was a time when there was very strong support for a subway project as it's presented in this resolution today. And then what happened? What happened is, as a result of a political debate on this issue, Mayor Rob Ford was elected with an overwhelming majority. He spoke about the need to deal with Toronto's traffic congestion, and he spoke about the need for leadership, and he spoke about the need for vision, which was to do what many in the past have talked about but never got around to doing, and that is to give Toronto, at the very least, the beginning of a major infrastructure project that would see it become a world leader in terms of its planning for the future when it comes to transit. Mayor Rob Ford was elected with that mandate.

And then what happened? Well, Speaker, here's what happened—and we have seen this so many times. When the money is committed, \$8.4 billion by this province—look, I give credit to this government for having made that commitment. Then what happened? The money is committed, the vision is there, and then the political infighting begins around the table at the Toronto city council chambers. What brought that on? Individual councillors started to look at this proposal, to say, "Wait a minute. If we put all of that \$8.4 billion into this dedicated line, I may be left out. I'm going to start lobbying for my ward. I want to see my little piece of the action happening here."

The next thing we know, Speaker, what should have been a major commitment and a focused commitment on the part of the Toronto city council began an infight that resulted in what we've seen for the last number of weeks. It's a disgrace. It's an embarrassment. It's an embarrassment for me, as an elected member of this Legislature, to see what is happening in that council. Everyone wants their piece of that pie, but what happens on a project like this when that happens: We get, as the member who spoke previously said, just anything. Anything is better than nothing. No, Speaker, anything is not better than nothing. What is the best is what is right, and what is right here is that we commit that the government of this province show some leadership and say, "Enough is enough. We're going to do this project because it's the right thing to do."

Speaker, I want to point out that Metrolinx was appointed for the very moment that we're seeing today. There is a reason that there are no elected officials on the board of Metrolinx. Why? Because we knew that the minute that you get elected officials on to a board like that, they begin the infighting, and we can never get on with the implementation of a major project because everyone wants their little piece—and while the pieces are taken out, we have nothing left and we're back to the rhetoric of "anything is better than nothing." Well, it's not. Metrolinx has a responsibility to implement, and at the end of the day, what we have a responsibility to do in this chamber is to show the leadership that is not being shown at Toronto city council. We have a responsibility to ensure that provincial infrastructure dollars, some \$8.4 billion, are focused and are used in the best way possible to provide the best possible transit project for the city of Toronto. That's what our responsibility is.

And I'd like to suggest this while we're having this discussion: that I believe it's important for this Legislature to look very carefully at the governance structure of how we plan and how we implement transit projects, not only in the city of Toronto but in the greater Toronto and Hamilton area. Because as long it's fragmented, as long as we have a fragmented governance structure, we will repeat this scenario over and over again: municipality fighting municipality, ward fighting ward. Everyone wants their little piece. We have a responsibility, and from what I am hearing it's going to fall to this caucus, to the Progressive Conservative caucus of this province, to show leadership on that very issue. And what we will promise the people of Ontario and certainly the greater Toronto area is that we will show the leadership that this government has refused to show; we will ensure that infrastructure projects are focused; and that we will lead the greater Toronto and Hamilton area into the future with good planning, good governance structure and good, solid leadership decisions. That is what this motion proposes for the Legislature today.

Speaker, I would encourage members of the government and members of the third party to look at what the objective of this motion is and join us in ensuring that a strong message is sent, not only through this Legislature, but to the council at the city of Toronto and to people throughout the greater Toronto-Hamilton area—hat the future of transit rests with this caucus, with the leadership of Tim Hudak and the Progressive Conservative Party.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The member for Etobicoke Centre.

1710

**Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to be able to rise.

I listened with great interest to the members across who speak about really believing in what you are being told by your constituents, about representing your constituents—Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke and other members who stood and said there needs to be consultation.

Interestingly enough, if you read this particular motion, it says, "the entire Eglinton crosstown line

underground.” Well, I don’t know if anybody is quite aware yet, it stops at Jane Street, but Eglinton continues to Mississauga. That part which is in my riding hasn’t had the discussion on what’s going to happen—above-ground, underground, El, it doesn’t make any difference. So I would think there should be some opportunity for the constituents to have some input as to what they might like to have in their communities, since they are part of the city of Toronto.

And by the way, I do not have a subway in my riding. There’s a good example of where it would be premature to determine ahead of time, without public consultation, due diligence, if you like, by an elected body represented by Mr. Holyday, the deputy mayor, in one case, and not have the opportunity to have that conversation and dialogue.

So here we are in a position where we’re being asked to preclude without consultation, to preclude without having a discussion, and then that doesn’t even come to a very complex area before we get to the airport, which has Highway 401, Highway 427 south and north, much less one of the most congested crossroads at Eglinton and Martin Grove, with the third-highest incidence of collisions in Toronto. You need significant study before you can just determine one way or another that it will be aboveground or underground. It may be a combination of cut and tunnel, it may be underground, it may be above, but you cannot do that without having a conversation with the people it impacts and affects who live in that community.

As difficult as democracy is, as messy as it can be, it’s far better than benevolent dictatorship, or dictatorship of any kind, where you just go in and say, “Because I know best, this is what you’re going to do.”

**Mr. Todd Smith:** It was a clear mandate.

**Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield:** There is no clear mandate. The clear mandate lies with the council who are duly represented to work on behalf of the people who elect them.

For me, again, it does not represent my community, and that’s exactly what the member from Renfrew–Nipissing–Pembroke said: Listen to your community. I’m listening to my community.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments? Further debate?

**Ms. Tracy MacCharles:** I want to begin by saying I find it interesting that members opposite raising this motion talk about frustration and embarrassment when, in fact, it’s incredibly frustrating to see \$8.4 billion sitting idle on the table, ready to be invested to keep our people of Toronto and the greater Toronto area moving more efficiently. It’s incredibly frustrating.

I can speak uniquely from the perspective of both Durham and Toronto in the riding of Pickering–Scarborough East. The call I get the most every day is not whether people are for the subways or for LRT. The call I get the most from my constituents is, “When are we getting on with transit? We need the transit plans to go forward to get us to work, to school and other places.” So that’s what’s frustrating.

This motion is very vague, it’s inappropriate, it’s fiscally irresponsible, and it continues and contributes to the delays experienced and the frustrations we are all experiencing and witnessing. As the MOU says, it is the mayor of Toronto and the council that must approve the plan going forward. The process needs to be respected through thoughtful planning and council discussions. This shouldn’t be one-up gamesmanship and bumper-sticker sloganeering.

Today, the PC Party refuses to respect that due process. It seeks to overturn a council decision, a 25 to 18 vote. This is completely unacceptable, and we will not be supporting this motion on that basis.

We will, however, work with Toronto. We’ll continue to have open and honest dialogues and we’ll be working with them in partnership, as we have done for the last eight years.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** The leader of the third party.

**Ms. Andrea Horwath:** It’s my pleasure to come into the chamber and speak a little bit about the motion that has been under discussion for the last little while here in the chamber. I have to say, I find it quite surprising in many, many ways that we’re having this debate on the floor of the Legislature, because we’re in a situation where we have a provincial government that was very quick to pull \$4 billion out of Transit City not so long ago. So really, when you think about who the first people were, in recent times, to turn their back on transit plans for the city of Toronto, it was the McGuinty Liberals. I think they’re the ones who sent out the first signal that all was not well with making sure that the people of the GTA or the people of Toronto were able to get back and forth around their community in an effective way.

I spent some time on the transit system a little while ago talking to people who ride the system day in and day out, and it’s pretty shocking to see the kinds of days that folks have to endure trying to get from one place to another in Toronto. Unfortunately, it’s the people in some of the lowest-income neighbourhoods, the people who are struggling to make ends meet, struggling to find work and to keep work, who are having to take the longest transit trips of all.

I bumped into a young man on a bus who was carrying an infant, and he had two toddlers with him. He was telling me that he invests, in terms of the time that he spends on transit every day, seven hours. He invests seven hours a day on transit, because the system is so poor and does not meet his needs. It takes him seven hours because, for three and a half hours in the morning, he has to go in one direction to take his kid to child care—his youngest—then he has to go in another direction to take his other kids to school and then in yet another direction to get to work. He has to spend that three and a half hours in the morning and in the afternoon to be able to make his family function.

Speaker, that is unacceptable. So here we are, talking about transit again, when this government did nothing to make sure that Transit City was enshrined in the city of Toronto, because they pulled their funding out of it.

Now we have the opposition weighing into this debate by saying that there have to be subways in the city of Toronto, notwithstanding the fact that the Transit City plan actually had both, and in fact I think the plan that city council now has on the table, which the city has had a majority of members supporting, actually includes both underground and aboveground lines. It shouldn't be that we're once again stalling off the development, the building of more transit in this city for the people who need it simply because of this political bickering that's going on and the political one-upmanship that's happening between the Liberals and the Conservatives. It's absolutely unacceptable.

We have a Premier that signed an agreement with the mayor when the mayor decided to ignore the council and go in his own direction. Now all of a sudden the Liberals are saying, "Well, we think we're going to do something different again." Part of the problem is that nobody is paying attention to the fact that transit—the more we fight, the more it's being delayed.

So here we have a situation where even though the Liberals like to talk the talk around transit, they're certainly not walking the walk in terms of the funding. They walked away from their commitment, and that put everything into uncertainty, which opened up the door for the new mayor who got elected to say, "Well, gee, the province has already backtracked on its commitments. I think we need to go in a totally different direction." That's what he did. He went in a totally different direction.

All the while, the horizon for the transit needs of the people of Toronto, the people of Scarborough, the people in Malvern—all the while, these folks are watching their future in terms of access to decent transit become further and further and further and further away. So shame on everybody for making this a bigger mess instead of actually getting our heads together and getting transit built in this city, because that's what's necessary.

Speaker, there are other members of my caucus who are going to speak to this issue, but I have to say that it's a sad day when, for political points, we end up muddying the waters here once again.

1720

New Democrats will not be supporting the motion. New Democrats did support the Transit City plan in its original form when it first came forward. We think that there are ways to affordably and reasonably get people moved around this huge community of the greater Toronto area, and we think that we need to get down to that work. So we are looking forward to a clear, clear signal being sent for once, for a change, from the government as to what they're planning to do to make sure that there is transit built in the city of Toronto.

I'm telling you, these people that I met on the transit system have been waiting far too long. There's no way that people should be missing the opportunity to make dinner for their children, to have time for them to deal with their homework and do all of those things after work, simply because they're stuck on transit and they

can't get home in time to have a decent life with their kids. It is unacceptable, it has gone on for far too long, and I would say shame on a lot of people in this room who have made it worse.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Mr. Bas Balkissoon:** At the outset, I want to tell you that when I first got elected to city council in 1988—from then until today, I've always fully believed that an underground transit system in our country, with the weather conditions we have, is the best way to go. But I just want to state a couple of facts after listening to my friends on the other side.

The member from Newmarket–Aurora says you should implement the best. I want to remind the member from Newmarket–Aurora that when I was a member of the TTC commission, that party made us rebuild our old GM buses by buying rejects from the Caribbean. It was shameful. We had to buy the Caribbean reject buses to rebuild the Toronto buses to keep them running until they were 18 years old. My friend from Beaches–East York will remember that.

They said we should respect Mayor Rob Ford, that he ran on the basis of better transit for Toronto. I would like to remind them that when they got elected, Mr. Mel Lastman, the mayor of the day, whom I served under, ran on the same premise. And what did they do to him? They cut off the agreement between the province and the city for any funding to transit.

So for those members on the other side to lecture us about transit today—I would like to just remind them a little bit. Stand up in front of the mirror and look at yourself again.

Madam Speaker, the member from Thornhill said that we have so many regional transits; we should have one. I will remind him that his party created the Greater Toronto Services Board to manage transit in the GTA, but they strangled the association without any money, so it died within two years. They should be embarrassed about that. They made sure the organization failed.

So I don't know what they're saying. They seem to speak on both sides.

I will remind all of them: They all talk about world-class cities' transit services. Well, I want to let you know that in world-class cities transit is built by the federal government, with major funding from their federal governments, in all parts of the world. We don't have a federal government at the table. At least the provincial government is at the table.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke and said he loves Toronto, but this is not about a one third/one third/one third. He's talking about provincial money. He's willing to forgive Mayor Rob Ford for his third. And he's willing to forgive his friends in Ottawa for their third, because they used to be here, and he can't disappoint them.

So don't lecture me about subways. I'm sorry to tell you that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Mr. David Zimmer:** Speaker, I'm going to vote against this. I'm going to vote against this because this motion shows no respect for the will of the city of Toronto council. What it does show is that that party opposite—here is the motive for why they're involved in this: They've got zero seats in Toronto. The Liberals have 23 seats. The NDP have five seats. The PC Party of Ontario has zero seats in Toronto, and they're wading into this issue and choosing sides with the mayor in this case, rather than sitting back and respecting the will of council. Council has spoken on this issue several times in recent weeks. Just the other day, the new TTC board was constituted, and it looks as if the makeup of the TTC perhaps is not—I don't expect it is going to be synonymous with the mayor's point of view on this.

So why has the PC Party waded into this Toronto issue? They have never paid much attention to what goes on in Toronto. That's why they can't win a single seat in Toronto in the last 10 years. Why can't they win a seat in Toronto? Because the people of Toronto, the voters of Toronto, know that the PC Party just does not understand Toronto issues in what whatsoever. And this whole business of what to do with Toronto transit is just further evidence of—and I use this word in the technical sense—true ignorance of what's going on in Toronto civic life.

So I come back to my question: Why wouldn't the PCs, like other responsible politicians, in their dealings with another level of government, in this case the city of Toronto, say, "Look, here's our contribution. Our money is on the table, \$8.4 billion. Now, you, city of Toronto, sort out what you want to do. Get back to us with a collective view of what the city of Toronto wants to do with its transportation issues. Then we'll sit down and go from there."

We've got this bizarre situation where the mayor of Toronto is at odds with the majority of his council. We've got this bizarre situation where the mayor of Toronto is at odds or was at odds with the chief executive officer at TTC. So rather than sit down around the table and try to figure out what's going on, he fires him. Then what happens? Well, the rest of the council gets upset about that, and they end up discharging everybody from the TTC board and constituting a new board, which is more in sympathy with the will of the majority of the members of council.

Why would the PC Party want to wander into that and stir that up by choosing sides with the mayor, rather than sitting back and saying, "Council, collectively, let us know what you want to do"? It's divisive politics at its worst. They can't win a seat in Toronto—not one of the seats in Toronto have they held in the last 10 years.

What's their fallback position? Is their fallback position in any way trying to bring the parties together, to resolve the issues? No. They want to wade in there, all of those members from outside of Toronto, and they want to stir up the pot in Toronto. They want to dictate what Toronto should do, just the way they dictated what Toronto should have done on the amalgamation issue.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Order.

The member from Beaches—East York.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** I listened intently to my friend the leader of the official opposition when he began. He began with a very famous couple of lines from Peter Ustinov, that Toronto is New York run by the Swiss. In fact, that was probably true when Peter Ustinov coined that famous phrase, because people came from all over the world when I was a mayor and when some of the people who are in this room today were serving on council in Toronto. They came from all over the world to study a city that worked.

But this was before amalgamation. Once amalgamation came, nobody came to study us anymore; nobody came and said, like Peter Ustinov, that this was a city like New York that's run by the Swiss. What they came to see is a city that is increasingly dysfunctional, a city that is very difficult to govern and a city with multiple, multiple problems.

I feel sorry some days for Mayor Ford, as hard as that might be for some people to believe. I feel sorry because he has an impossible job that cannot ever be done by a person with his capabilities or with perhaps any capabilities at all.

**1730**

We have a city that just doesn't work, and, thrown into this, we have a dysfunctional system of transportation. We have a system that could have and should have been fixed many years ago. When I was on the council, along with the member from Scarborough—Rouge River, with the current member of economic development, with Eglinton—Lawrence and Scarborough Southwest—we were all there, and they will vouchsafe what happened.

What happened is that there was a proposal for four subways to be built—four subways. We had a big debate and the council agreed in Toronto that we would support all four subways being built. All of a sudden, along came a government that said, "We don't have any money and we're not going to build it anymore. It's too expensive, and the people can't afford it."

I remember that debate. We were told to choose. We were told to choose one, and the one that was by far and away the best was the Eglinton line. There is no doubt. It was supported by all of the six mayors who then existed because that line ran through the centre of what was then the city of Toronto. It went to the airport, but more importantly, it started in Etobicoke, went through the city of York, then it went through Toronto, then it went through East York, then it went through North York and then it went through Scarborough.

**Mr. Mike Colle:** Etobicoke.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** I started with Etobicoke. You should be listening. I started with Etobicoke.

It was supported because it had the potential for ridership, and that is still true today. It is the ridership that is important for building a subway. It isn't, as was said today—and I heard one person say it. I know Doug Ford, the famous councillor who occasionally advises his

brother what to do, says, "Build it and they will come." I think he watches too much of the movie *Field of Dreams*—because if you build it, they don't come.

We know that because that's what Mel Lastman convinced council to do: to give up on the best option, which was Eglinton and to build it along Eglinton, because he had the dream, and it was a good dream. I'm sure to this day he has the dream of that nodule up there that is in North York, around Sheppard and Yonge, which was building and really booming in those days. He was talking about building a subway that would connect that dream because that was going to be the new headquarters of the city of Toronto. That's where all the building was going to take place, and council, I think, reluctantly bought into it. Because we did, Eglinton was filled in, and to what avail?

I look today because we have a motion before us saying, "Build it and they will come." Well, the people are still studying this. We have sort of a panel. I read the *Toronto Sun* every day. I read it because I want to know what Conservatives think or at least where they're getting their ideas from. I read it and see where they deadpan all of the people who are on that board—you know, former mayors, people who have no experience, people who are left-wing hangers-on and all these other things.

But people around there who know a bit about this, including Dr. Gordon Chong, for whom I have great respect—because we all worked with him. We all worked with him. He was there, and he has a pretty good idea. But he has already told the mayor, "If you're going to build Sheppard, if you're going to do it at all, a whole bunch of things have to happen." First of all, you're going to have to have development levies, and who wants to pay those development levies? Then, you're going to have to have parking levies, and who wants in the city to pay a parking levy?

**Mr. Mike Colle:** "Nooobody."

**Mr. Michael Prue:** He's doing a good Mel over there. Then you're also going to have to have road tolls, and all of these things are going to have to come together in order for Sheppard to be financially viable. The reason is because there is no possibility at this time, or in the near future, that we will ever have enough people get on that subway to make it viable.

We've gone back and taken a pretty good look. In 1986, when the study for Sheppard was first done by Mayor Lastman and his people, it was estimated that there would be 64,000 jobs in the North York Centre created as a result of the Sheppard subway. Well, they built that little portion. It was supposed to create 64,000 jobs in that nodule. Do you know how many were created in the last 20 years?

**Mr. Mike Colle:** Thirteen thousand.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** No, 800. There are 13,000 there but there were 12,000 before. There are 800 additional jobs that have come to the North York Centre.

He also said that the Scarborough centre was going to increase by 50,000 jobs after that section was built. Do

you know how many jobs were created in the Scarborough centre?

**Interjection:** How many?

**Mr. Michael Prue:** None. Actually, it's down 700. Then the estimate was that Toronto, as a result of the building of the Sheppard subway, was going to create 670,000 extra jobs. The reality is that Toronto has only created 70,000 jobs since the Sheppard subway was built, so it's down 600,000 jobs from the estimate.

I don't buy into what is being said: Build it and they will come. You build a subway when you know there's going to be ridership. You build a subway when you know that people are going to get on it and pay the fare, and it's going to pay its own way and is not going to be subsidized forever.

There is a subway station called Bessarion. People might know where that is. It's like a ghost town. Of all the subway stations in North America, it has the least number of people entering it on a daily basis. That's the reality. And here we have a motion saying just go ahead with it anyway. Well, I think that the people of Toronto don't deserve that; they don't deserve a white elephant.

In terms of burying Eglinton, you know, I would gladly support burying Eglinton if it served the right purpose and if it was not to the exclusion of everything else in this city. But if you bury the whole of Eglinton, if you do what Mayor Ford has requested and what his council has rejected, then you are going to rob Peter to pay Paul—I don't know how else to put it—because when you do that, everybody else does not get the kind of system that they need.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** Finch. Finch gets nothing.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** You're not going to have Finch. Now, this is the most important one. That whole Finch corridor is home to a lot of people, nearly a million people, and they are so underserved. If you look at what runs along Finch in this city, you will see you have nodules like Jane-Finch and Malvern, which tend to be amongst the poorest people in our city, people who desperately need a better way to get to work, people who desperately need some kind of transportation so that they can go on their own business. They will be getting nothing if we bury this whole subway—they will be getting nothing.

I hate to tell everybody here, but I don't think that there's any money. There's not enough money to do what dreams are made of. I'd like to quote Royson James—maybe some people like him, maybe some don't, but I've known Royson for many years.

**Mr. Rosario Marchese:** He went to Harbord Collegiate with me.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Yes, he went to Harbord Collegiate.

You know, he's been a writer—he writes for the *Toronto Star*, that bastion of liberalism. But he also says a lot of good things, and I quote him: "Anyone who supports subways—including the mayor, his greedy developer friends, Ontario opposition leader Tim Hudak

and you, reader—but is not prepared to contribute tax dollars, is living a fantasy.

“Wake up, people, I beg you. Please.”

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further debate?

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** I want to say, I am happy to follow His Worship the former mayor of East York in this debate. I make that comment advisedly because I remember being in a small TV studio with the former mayor of East York. I guess it must have been 1996, and we were engaged at that point in a pretty lively debate in the city of Toronto about the fate of the city and the future of the city because of the Conservative government and the policies that it put in place. I like to say to people that Mike Harris made me because it was the policies of that former government that really encouraged me to get involved in provincial politics and to battle against those.

1740

So, on this subject, let's talk just a little bit about the history. The member from Beaches–East York has gone through the transit history, but what was going on at that time under that previous government really puts this issue into relief: the amalgamation of the city of Toronto—nobody wanted that amalgamation. There was a referendum, and 76% of people voted against that amalgamation. No investment in transit—the filling in of the hole on Eglinton that the member for Beaches–East York has just talked about. And the downloading of services on to the city of Toronto, to the detriment of the city's ability to pay for those. That is a little bit of the history that I think is an important backdrop to what we're talking about today.

So what have we done? We've already invested nearly \$4 billion in transit in Toronto, including the rebuilding of Union Station and the building of the York-Spadina subway. We have made serious investments in the city of Toronto. On top of that, we are investing \$8.4 billion, and I just want to be clear: That's 100% provincial dollars. That is money that is going into the city of Toronto. And I have to take issue with the leader of the third party when she talks about \$4 billion coming out. That isn't what happened. It was a cash flow issue. That \$8.4 billion is still committed to transit in Toronto. So that is what we're doing.

The other myth that I think is floating around is that there is nothing happening right now. The fact is, on the Eglinton line, shovels are in the ground, the launching hole has been dug, the boring machines are being built, and that work has been ongoing, because one of the things that we said in the memorandum of understanding that was signed by the mayor was that we didn't want to lose time on the Eglinton line. That was one of the principles that we operated on, so that work on the Eglinton line has been ongoing.

What happened when the mayor was elected—and I was a newly minted Minister of Transportation: We knew that we needed to negotiate with the new mayor. There was a plan in place to spend the \$8.4 billion. A new mayor was elected, and we realized that we needed

to respect the democratic will of the city of Toronto, so we entered into a negotiation with the new mayor of Toronto, and a memorandum of understanding emerged from that. I just want to be clear, because I was the minister at the time and I was very, very adamant that in that memorandum of understanding there must be a responsibility and an obligation for the minister to take to cabinet the decisions that were being made, and for the mayor to take to council the decisions that were being made and that were in that memorandum of understanding.

Let's be clear, Madam Speaker: The mayor could have taken that memorandum of understanding the next day to council; the mayor could have built consensus and could have taken that memorandum of understanding to council. The mayor chose not to do that. So now we have a situation where there has been a lot of confusion that has been sown about this issue. I believe that the motion today sows further confusion, and I think it's probably in the best political interests of the party opposite, of the Conservatives, to sow that confusion, because they actually have no credibility on transit. They have not any credibility on support for the city of Toronto. That is what this motion is about as far as I'm concerned.

What we are about is a couple of things: getting the transit built in Toronto; investing that \$8.4 billion in Toronto, because we know how critical it is to the gridlock in the GTA that we get transit right in Mississauga, in Durham, in York region and in the city of Toronto. So we're investing in all of those areas to make sure that people have an option and that culture shift of getting people out of their cars and getting them on to transit can continue. So we're going to continue to invest.

But, Madam Speaker, we have been very clear from the time we were elected that we respect the will of local government, we respect the will of council, and that was part of the memorandum of understanding. That is exactly what we will continue to do: respect that vote at city council. So I hope that the party opposite will have an epiphany and they will join us in supporting council's will as they decide what they believe is best for the city of Toronto in investing that \$8.4 billion. We are at the table, we are their partners, and we're going to continue to work with them.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Further comments?

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** Let me begin by stating unequivocally, like my colleagues from Scarborough have throughout this debate, that I support the notion of expanding the Sheppard subway line to the Scarborough Town Centre and beyond if that's needed. That's nothing new for me. In fact, that's a position that I've advocated for over 17 years. Let me also state unequivocally that I prefer the underground option for the Eglinton crosstown line, like all of my colleagues from Scarborough.

I want to tell you, I'm really proud that all of my colleagues from Scarborough here on this side of House have stood up today and taken that position, and we've done it consistently. I want to thank them for their contribution to this debate.

But, Madam Speaker, let me also state unequivocally, regardless of our personal view, that I believe this motion before us today is an insult to people of Scarborough, and it's an insult to the people of Toronto because what it does is it arrogantly suggests that the wishes of the city of Toronto and the people of Toronto simply don't matter, that they're absolutely irrelevant, that it just doesn't matter here in this place. We take a different perspective on this side of the House.

That's not new for those guys over there in the PC Party. We've seen that before. That was the same attitude that the current Leader of the Opposition had and former Premier Mike Harris, when they imposed an unwanted amalgamation on the city of Toronto years ago. We've seen it before. Obviously, with that Leader of the Opposition, some things just never change.

I and my fellow Toronto MPPs have worked very hard to ensure that that \$8.4 billion committed to expand public transit in Toronto is maintained, despite challenging fiscal times. It has always been the responsibility of municipalities to determine their transit priorities, and the role of provincial and federal governments has always been to provide the funding. Ironically, that tradition was destroyed at one time by the now-Leader of the Opposition when he served in that previous government, when they walked away from public transit. That mistake resulted in eight lost years, and we're still trying to catch up those years.

This McGuinty government has invested in public transit like no government before us. We're in the midst of one of the largest transit builds in Canadian history. This \$8.4 billion commitment to Toronto is an important commitment to Toronto's future.

The problem is—I think we can probably all agree on this—the mayor and city council have dropped the ball on this. The province is here with our commitment, and the council and mayor cannot get on the same page. That, to me, is an embarrassment to the city. They've let Toronto residents down.

What we should be doing here today is celebrating one of the most significant investments in Toronto's history. Instead, what we're doing is we're acknowledging the fact that there's a Gong Show happening at city hall these days. The Leader of the Opposition's attempt to exploit this situation through his selfish motion just adds fuel to the fire. It doesn't help one bit.

Let's be real here: How does the Leader of the Opposition think the province can build a transit line if the city refuses to support it? You can't do that. It's not possible. As much as I remain a supporter of subways, I don't think it's right nor do I think it's ethical for the province to run roughshod over the will of Toronto city council. That's what this motion purports to do. That's why many of us on this side of the House cannot support this motion. You want to run roughshod over the rights of city council, which means you're totally disrespecting the people of the city of Toronto.

As I said earlier, you've done it before, and you want to do it again. The people in my community of Scarborough—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Order. Carry on.

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** —the people in Etobicoke, the people right across Toronto remember what you did to us when you brought us the megacity, remember the downloading that followed. They're not going to put up with it again.

We're here to build a strong city of Toronto. We're here to support strong city-building. We're here to invest \$8.4 billion, a record amount of investment, into the city of Toronto. We won't be hoodwinked by these foolish motions. We're here to build and that's what we're going to do.

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Order. Mr. Hudak has moved opposition day motion number 2. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion, say "aye."

All those opposed to the motion, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Call in the members. This will be a 10-minute bell.

*The division bells rang from 1750 to 1800.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** All those in favour will please rise—

*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Order. All those in favour will please rise one at a time and be recorded by the Clerk.

#### Ayes

Arnott, Ted	Jones, Sylvia	Ouellette, Jerry J.
Bailey, Robert	Klees, Frank	Pettapiece, Randy
Barrett, Toby	Leone, Rob	Scott, Laurie
Chudleigh, Ted	MacLaren, Jack	Shurman, Peter
Clark, Steve	MacLeod, Lisa	Smith, Todd
Dunlop, Garfield	McDonell, Jim	Thompson, Lisa M.
Elliott, Christine	McKenna, Jane	Walker, Bill
Fedeli, Victor	McNaughton, Monte	Wilson, Jim
Hardeman, Ernie	Miller, Norm	Witmer, Elizabeth
Harris, Michael	Milligan, Rob E.	Yakubuski, John
Hudak, Tim	Nichols, Rick	Yurek, Jeff
Jackson, Rod	O'Toole, John	

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** All those opposed will please rise one at a time and be recorded by the Clerk.

#### Nays

Albanese, Laura	Duguid, Brad	Moridi, Reza
Armstrong, Teresa J.	Duncan, Dwight	Murray, Glen R.
Balkissoon, Bas	Flynn, Kevin Daniel	Naqvi, Yasir
Bartolucci, Rick	Forster, Cindy	Natyshak, Taras
Bentley, Christopher	Gerretsen, John	Oraziotti, David
Berardinetti, Lorenzo	Gravelle, Michael	Piruzza, Teresa
Best, Margaret	Horwath, Andrea	Prue, Michael
Bisson, Gilles	Hoskins, Eric	Qaadri, Shafiq
Bradley, James J.	Jaczek, Helena	Sandals, Liz
Broten, Laurel C.	Jeffrey, Linda	Schein, Jonah
Cansfield, Donna H.	Kwinter, Monte	Sergio, Mario
Chan, Michael	Leal, Jeff	Singh, Jagmeet
Chiarelli, Bob	MacCharles, Tracy	Sorbara, Greg
Collie, Mike	Mangat, Amrit	Sousa, Charles
Coteau, Michael	Marchese, Rosario	Tabuns, Peter
Crack, Grant	Matthews, Deborah	Takhar, Harinder S.
Craitor, Kim	McGuinty, Dalton	Taylor, Monique
Damerla, Dipika	McMeekin, Ted	Vanthof, John
Delaney, Bob	McNeely, Phil	Wong, Soo

Dhillon, Vic  
Dickson, Joe  
DiNovo, Cheri

Meilleur, Madeleine  
Miller, Paul  
Milloy, John

Wynne, Kathleen O.  
Zimmer, David

I declare the motion lost.  
*Motion negatived.*

**The Clerk of the Assembly (Ms. Deborah Deller):**  
The ayes are 35; the nays are 65.  
*Interjections.*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Julia Munro):** Before I adjourn, I would just remind members that it is protocol for them to wait until the Speaker has left the dais.  
This House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.  
*The House adjourned at 1805.*

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO**  
**ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO**

Lieutenant Governor / Lieutenant-gouverneur: Hon. / L'hon. David C. Onley, O.Ont.

Speaker / Président: Hon. / L'hon. Dave Levac

Clerk / Greffière: Deborah Deller

Clerks-at-the-Table / Greffiers parlementaires: Todd Decker, Lisa Freedman, Tonia Grannum

Sergeant-at-Arms / Sergent d'armes: Dennis Clark

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Albanese, Laura (LIB)	York South–Weston / York-Sud–Weston	
Armstrong, Teresa J. (NDP)	London–Fanshawe	
<b>Arnott, Ted (PC)</b>	Wellington–Halton Hills	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Premier vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée
Bailey, Robert (PC)	Sarnia–Lambton	
<b>Balkissoon, Bas (LIB)</b>	Scarborough–Rouge River	Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Président du comité plénier de l'Assemblée Deputy Speaker / Vice-président
Barrett, Toby (PC)	Haldimand–Norfolk	
<b>Bartolucci, Hon. / L'hon. Rick (LIB)</b>	Sudbury	Chair of Cabinet / Président du Conseil des ministres Minister of Northern Development and Mines / Ministre du Développement du Nord et des Mines
<b>Bentley, Hon. / L'hon. Christopher (LIB)</b>	London West / London-Ouest	Minister of Energy / Ministre de l'Énergie
Berardinetti, Lorenzo (LIB)	Scarborough Southwest / Scarborough-Sud-Ouest	
<b>Best, Hon. / L'hon. Margaret R. (LIB)</b>	Scarborough–Guildwood	Minister of Consumer Services / Ministre des Services aux consommateurs
Bisson, Gilles (NDP)	Timmins–James Bay / Timmins–Baie James	House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire de parti reconnu
<b>Bradley, Hon. / L'hon. James J. (LIB)</b>	St. Catharines	Minister of the Environment / Ministre de l'Environnement Deputy Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjoint du gouvernement
<b>Broten, Hon. / L'hon. Laurel C. (LIB)</b>	Etobicoke–Lakeshore	Minister of Education / Ministre de l'Éducation Minister Responsible for Women's Issues / Ministre déléguée à la Condition féminine
Campbell, Sarah (NDP)	Kenora–Rainy River	
Cansfield, Donna H. (LIB)	Etobicoke Centre / Etobicoke-Centre	
<b>Chan, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Markham–Unionville	Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport / Ministre de Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport
<b>Chiarelli, Hon. / L'hon. Bob (LIB)</b>	Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean	Minister of Infrastructure / Ministre de l'Infrastructure Minister of Transportation / Ministre des Transports
Chudleigh, Ted (PC)	Halton	
Clark, Steve (PC)	Leeds–Grenville	
Colle, Mike (LIB)	Eglinton–Lawrence	
Coteau, Michael (LIB)	Don Valley East / Don Valley-Est	
Crack, Grant (LIB)	Glengarry–Prescott–Russell	
Craitor, Kim (LIB)	Niagara Falls	
Damerla, Dipika (LIB)	Mississauga East–Cooksville / Mississauga-Est–Cooksville	
Delaney, Bob (LIB)	Mississauga–Streetsville	
Dhillon, Vic (LIB)	Brampton West / Brampton-Ouest	
Dickson, Joe (LIB)	Ajax–Pickering	
DiNovo, Cheri (NDP)	Parkdale–High Park	
<b>Duguid, Hon. / L'hon. Brad (LIB)</b>	Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre	Minister of Economic Development and Innovation / Ministre du Développement économique et de l'Innovation
<b>Duncan, Hon. / L'hon. Dwight (LIB)</b>	Windsor–Tecumseh	Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet / Président du Conseil de gestion du gouvernement Deputy Premier / Vice-premier ministre Minister of Finance / Ministre des Finances
Dunlop, Garfield (PC)	Simcoe North / Simcoe-Nord	
Elliott, Christine (PC)	Whitby–Oshawa	Deputy Leader, Official Opposition / Chef adjointe de l'opposition officielle

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Fedeli, Victor (PC)	Nipissing	
Flynn, Kevin Daniel (LIB)	Oakville	
Forster, Cindy (NDP)	Welland	Deputy House Leader, Recognized Party / Leader parlementaire adjointe de parti reconnu
Gélinas, France (NDP)	Nickel Belt	
<b>Gerretsen, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kingston and the Islands / Kingston et les Îles	Attorney General / Procureur général
<b>Gravelle, Hon. / L'hon. Michael (LIB)</b>	Thunder Bay–Superior North / Thunder Bay–Superior-Nord	Minister of Natural Resources / Ministre des Richesses naturelles
Hardeman, Ernie (PC)	Oxford	
Harris, Michael (PC)	Kitchener–Conestoga	
Hillier, Randy (PC)	Lanark–Frontenac–Lennox and Addington	
Horwath, Andrea (NDP)	Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre	Leader, Recognized Party / Chef de parti reconnu Leader, New Democratic Party of Ontario / Chef du Nouveau parti démocratique de l'Ontario
<b>Hoskins, Hon. / L'hon. Eric (LIB)</b>	St. Paul's	Minister of Children and Youth Services / Ministre des Services à l'enfance et à la jeunesse
Hudak, Tim (PC)	Niagara West–Glanbrook / Niagara-Ouest–Glanbrook	Leader, Official Opposition / Chef de l'opposition officielle Leader, Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti progressiste-conservateur de l'Ontario
Jackson, Rod (PC)	Barrie	
Jaczek, Helena (LIB)	Oak Ridges–Markham	
<b>Jeffrey, Hon. / L'hon. Linda (LIB)</b>	Brampton–Springdale	Minister of Labour / Ministre du Travail Minister Responsible for Seniors / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires des personnes âgées
Jones, Sylvia (PC)	Dufferin–Caledon	Deputy Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire adjointe de l'opposition officielle
Klees, Frank (PC)	Newmarket–Aurora	
Kwinter, Monte (LIB)	York Centre / York-Centre	
Leal, Jeff (LIB)	Peterborough	
Leone, Rob (PC)	Cambridge	
<b>Levac, Hon. / L'hon. Dave (LIB)</b>	Brant	Speaker / Président de l'Assemblée législative
MacCharles, Tracy (LIB)	Pickering–Scarborough East / Pickering–Scarborough-Est	
MacLaren, Jack (PC)	Carleton–Mississippi Mills	
MacLeod, Lisa (PC)	Nepean–Carleton	
Mangat, Amrit (LIB)	Mississauga–Brampton South / Mississauga–Brampton-Sud	
Mantha, Michael (NDP)	Algoma–Manitoulin	
Marchese, Rosario (NDP)	Trinity–Spadina	
<b>Matthews, Hon. / L'hon. Deborah (LIB)</b>	London North Centre / London-Centre-Nord	Minister of Health and Long-Term Care / Ministre de la Santé et des Soins de longue durée
Mauro, Bill (LIB)	Thunder Bay–Atikokan	
McDonell, Jim (PC)	Stormont–Dundas–South Glengarry	
<b>McGuinty, Hon. / L'hon. Dalton (LIB)</b>	Ottawa South / Ottawa-Sud	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs / Ministre des Affaires intergouvernementales Premier / Premier ministre Leader, Government / Chef du gouvernement Leader, Liberal Party of Ontario / Chef du Parti libéral de l'Ontario
McKenna, Jane (PC)	Burlington	
<b>McMeekin, Hon. / L'hon. Ted (LIB)</b>	Ancaster–Dundas–Flamborough–Westdale	Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs / Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Alimentation et des Affaires rurales
McNaughton, Monte (PC)	Lambton–Kent–Middlesex	
McNeely, Phil (LIB)	Ottawa–Orléans	
<b>Meilleur, Hon. / L'hon. Madeleine (LIB)</b>	Ottawa–Vanier	Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services / Ministre de la Sécurité communautaire et des Services correctionnels Minister Responsible for Francophone Affairs / Ministre déléguée aux Affaires francophones
Miller, Norm (PC)	Parry Sound–Muskoka	
<b>Miller, Paul (NDP)</b>	Hamilton East–Stoney Creek / Hamilton-Est–Stoney Creek	Third Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Troisième vice-président du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative

Member and Party / Député(e) et parti	Constituency / Circonscription	Other responsibilities / Autres responsabilités
Milligan, Rob E. (PC)	Northumberland—Quinte West	
<b>Milloy, Hon. / L'hon. John (LIB)</b>	Kitchener Centre / Kitchener-Centre	Minister of Community and Social Services / Ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires Government House Leader / Leader parlementaire du gouvernement
Moridi, Reza (LIB)	Richmond Hill	
<b>Munro, Julia (PC)</b>	York—Simcoe	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House / Deuxième vice-présidente du Comité plénier de l'Assemblée législative
<b>Murray, Hon. / L'hon. Glen R. (LIB)</b>	Toronto Centre / Toronto-Centre	Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities / Ministre de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités
Naqvi, Yasir (LIB)	Ottawa Centre / Ottawa-Centre	
Natyshak, Taras (NDP)	Essex	
Nicholls, Rick (PC)	Chatham—Kent—Essex	
O'Toole, John (PC)	Durham	
Oraziotti, David (LIB)	Sault Ste. Marie	
Ouellette, Jerry J. (PC)	Oshawa	
Pettapiece, Randy (PC)	Perth—Wellington	
Piruzza, Teresa (LIB)	Windsor West / Windsor-Ouest	
Prue, Michael (NDP)	Beaches—East York	
Qaadri, Shafiq (LIB)	Etobicoke North / Etobicoke-Nord	
Sandals, Liz (LIB)	Guelph	
Schein, Jonah (NDP)	Davenport	
Scott, Laurie (PC)	Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock	
Sergio, Mario (LIB)	York West / York-Ouest	
Shurman, Peter (PC)	Thornhill	
Singh, Jagmeet (NDP)	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	
Smith, Todd (PC)	Prince Edward—Hastings	
Sorbara, Greg (LIB)	Vaughan	
<b>Sousa, Hon. / L'hon. Charles (LIB)</b>	Mississauga South / Mississauga-Sud	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration / Ministre des Affaires civiques et de l'Immigration
Tabuns, Peter (NDP)	Toronto—Danforth	
<b>Takhar, Hon. / L'hon. Harinder S. (LIB)</b>	Mississauga—Erindale	Minister of Government Services / Ministre des Services gouvernementaux
Taylor, Monique (NDP)	Hamilton Mountain	
Thompson, Lisa M. (PC)	Huron—Bruce	
Vanthof, John (NDP)	Timiskaming—Cochrane	
Walker, Bill (PC)	Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound	
Wilson, Jim (PC)	Simcoe—Grey	Opposition House Leader / Leader parlementaire de l'opposition officielle
Witmer, Elizabeth (PC)	Kitchener—Waterloo	
Wong, Soo (LIB)	Scarborough—Agincourt	
<b>Wynne, Hon. / L'hon. Kathleen O. (LIB)</b>	Don Valley West / Don Valley-Ouest	Minister of Aboriginal Affairs / Ministre des Affaires autochtones Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing / Ministre des Affaires municipales et du Logement
Yakubski, John (PC)	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	
Yurek, Jeff (PC)	Elgin—Middlesex—London	
Zimmer, David (LIB)	Willowdale	

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
COMITÉS PERMANENTS DE L'ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE**

**Standing Committee on Estimates / Comité permanent des budgets des dépenses**

Chair / Président: Michael Prue  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Taras Natyshak  
Grant Crack, Kim Craitor  
Vic Dhillon, Michael Harris  
Rob Leone, Taras Natyshak  
Rick Nicholls, Michael Prue  
Mario Sergio  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs /  
Comité permanent des finances et des affaires économiques**

Chair / Président: Bob Delaney  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Teresa Piruzza  
Bob Delaney, Victor Fedeli  
Cindy Forster, Monte McNaughton  
Yasir Naqvi, Teresa Piruzza  
Michael Prue, Peter Shurman  
Soo Wong  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Valerie Quioc Lim

**Standing Committee on General Government / Comité  
permanent des affaires gouvernementales**

Chair / Président: David Orazietti  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: David Zimmer  
Sarah Campbell, Michael Coteau  
Joe Dickson, Rosario Marchese  
David Orazietti, Laurie Scott  
Todd Smith, Jeff Yurek  
David Zimmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Sylwia Przewdziecki

**Standing Committee on Government Agencies / Comité  
permanent des organismes gouvernementaux**

Chair / Président: Bill Mauro  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Phil McNeely  
Donna H. Cansfield, Helena Jaczek  
Bill Mauro, Jim McDonell  
Phil McNeely, Randy Pettapiece  
Peter Tabuns, Monique Taylor  
Lisa M. Thompson  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Justice Policy / Comité permanent de  
la justice**

Chair / Présidente: Laura Albanese  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Shafiq Qaadri  
Laura Albanese, Teresa J. Armstrong  
Lorenzo Berardinetti, Mike Colle  
Frank Klees, Jack MacLaren  
Paul Miller, Rob E. Milligan  
Shafiq Qaadri  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly / Comité  
permanent de l'Assemblée législative**

Chair / Président: Garfield Dunlop  
Vice-Chair / Vice-présidente: Lisa MacLeod  
Laura Albanese, Bas Balkissoon  
Gilles Bisson, Donna H. Cansfield  
Steve Clark, Garfield Dunlop  
Jeff Leal, Lisa MacLeod  
Jonah Schein  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Trevor Day

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts / Comité permanent  
des comptes publics**

Chair / Président: Norm Miller  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Toby Barrett  
Toby Barrett, France Gélinas  
Phil McNeely, Norm Miller  
Reza Moridi, Jerry J. Ouellette  
Liz Sandals, Jagmeet Singh  
David Zimmer  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: William Short

**Standing Committee on Regulations and Private Bills / Comité  
permanent des règlements et des projets de loi d'intérêt privé**

Chair / Président: Peter Tabuns  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: John Vanthof  
Michael Coteau, Grant Crack  
Vic Dhillon, Randy Hillier  
Rod Jackson, Mario Sergio  
Peter Tabuns, John Vanthof  
Bill Walker  
Committee Clerk / Greffière: Tamara Pomanski

**Standing Committee on Social Policy / Comité permanent de  
la politique sociale**

Chair / Président: Ernie Hardeman  
Vice-Chair / Vice-président: Ted Chudleigh  
Ted Chudleigh, Dipika Damerla  
Cheri DiNovo, Kevin Daniel Flynn  
Ernie Hardeman, Tracy MacCharles  
Amrit Mangat, Michael Mantha  
Jane McKenna  
Committee Clerk / Greffier: Katch Koch





*Continued from back cover*

<b>Renewable energy</b>	
Mr. Victor Fedeli.....	909
Hon. Christopher Bentley.....	909
<b>Use of question period</b>	
Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....	910
The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac).....	910
<b>Minister's comments</b>	
Mr. Frank Klees .....	910
The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac).....	910
Mr. Jim Wilson .....	910

#### **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS**

Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....	911
-----------------------	-----

#### **MEMBERS' STATEMENTS / DÉCLARATIONS DES DÉPUTÉS**

<b>Epilepsy</b>	
Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer .....	911
<b>Epilepsy</b>	
Ms. Cheri DiNovo.....	911
<b>Epilepsy</b>	
Ms. Helena Jaczek.....	911
<b>Donald Stewart "Chip" Gordon</b>	
Mr. Monte McNaughton .....	912
<b>Royal Canadian Legion public speaking contest</b>	
Mr. Michael Mantha .....	912
<b>Prix Bernard Grandmaître</b>	
M. Phil McNeely.....	912
<b>Don Lobb</b>	
Ms. Sylvia Jones .....	912
<b>Windsor-Essex Economic Development Corp.</b>	
Mrs. Teresa Piruzza.....	913
<b>Suicide prevention</b>	
Ms. Lisa MacLeod .....	913

#### **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS / DÉPÔT DES PROJETS DE LOI**

<b>Education Amendment Act (Concussions), 2012, Bill 39, Ms. Broten / Loi de 2012 modifiant la Loi sur l'éducation (commotions cérébrales), projet de loi 39, Mme Broten</b>	
First reading agreed to.....	914

#### **Epilepsy Awareness Day Act, 2012, Bill 40, Ms. Jaczek / Loi de 2012 sur la Journée de sensibilisation à l'épilepsie, projet de loi 40, Mme Jaczek**

First reading agreed to.....	914
Ms. Helena Jaczek.....	914

#### **STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY AND RESPONSES / DÉCLARATIONS MINISTÉRIELLES ET RÉPONSES**

##### **Concussions / Commotions cérébrales**

Hon. Laurel C. Broten .....	914
Ms. Lisa MacLeod .....	915
Mr. Peter Tabuns .....	916

##### **PETITIONS / PÉTITIONS**

<b>Renewable energy</b>	
Mr. John O'Toole.....	916
<b>Public transit</b>	
Mr. Jonah Schein.....	917
<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. Todd Smith.....	917
<b>Hydro rates</b>	
Mr. Michael Mantha.....	917
<b>Education funding</b>	
Mr. Phil McNeely.....	917
<b>Curriculum</b>	
Mr. Steve Clark .....	918
<b>Diagnostic services</b>	
Mme France Gélinas .....	918
<b>Kidney disease</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal.....	918
<b>Chronic joint pain</b>	
Mr. Victor Fedeli.....	918
<b>Child protection</b>	
Mme France Gélinas .....	919
<b>Wind turbines</b>	
Mr. John O'Toole.....	919
<b>Dental care</b>	
Mme France Gélinas .....	919
<b>Kidney disease</b>	
Mr. Jeff Leal.....	919
<b>Visitors</b>	
Mr. Gilles Bisson .....	919

## OPPOSITION DAY / JOUR DE L'OPPOSITION

### Public transit

Mr. Tim Hudak .....	920
Mr. Peter Tabuns .....	922
Mr. Mike Colle .....	922
Mr. Peter Shurman.....	923
Mr. Jonah Schein .....	924
Ms. Soo Wong .....	925
Mr. Steve Clark.....	925
Mr. Rosario Marchese .....	926
Mr. Mario Sergio .....	927
Mr. Monte McNaughton.....	927
Ms. Cheri DiNovo .....	928
Mr. Lorenzo Berardinetti .....	928
Mr. John Yakabuski.....	929
Mrs. Laura Albanese.....	929
Mr. Frank Klees .....	930
Mrs. Donna H. Cansfield.....	930
Ms. Tracy MacCharles.....	931
Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	931
Mr. Bas Balkissoon.....	932
Mr. David Zimmer.....	933
Mr. Michael Prue .....	933
Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne.....	935
Hon. Brad Duguid.....	935
Motion negatived.....	937

# CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Tuesday 6 March 2012 / Mardi 6 mars 2012

## ORDERS OF THE DAY / ORDRE DU JOUR

<b>Family Caregiver Leave Act (Employment Standards Amendment), 2012, Bill 30, Mrs. Jeffrey / Loi de 2012 sur le congé familial pour les aidants naturels (modification des normes d'emploi), projet de loi 30, Mme Jeffrey</b>	
Mrs. Laura Albanese .....	889
Mr. Jeff Yurek .....	890
Ms. Cindy Forster .....	891
Mr. Jeff Leal .....	891
Mr. Steve Clark .....	891
Mrs. Laura Albanese .....	892
Mr. Jeff Yurek .....	892
Ms. Cheri DiNovo .....	895
Mrs. Laura Albanese .....	895
Mr. John O'Toole .....	896
Mr. John Vanthof .....	896
Mr. Jeff Yurek .....	896
Ms. Cheri DiNovo .....	897
Second reading debate deemed adjourned .....	899
<b>Wearing of ribbons</b>	
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	899

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS / PRÉSENTATION DES VISITEURS

Hon. Laurel C. Broten .....	899
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	899
Mr. Kevin Daniel Flynn .....	899
Mr. Frank Klees .....	899
Mr. John Vanthof .....	899
Hon. Michael Gravelle .....	899
Mrs. Julia Munro .....	899
Miss Monique Taylor .....	900
Mr. Michael Coteau .....	900
Mr. John O'Toole .....	900
Mr. Bill Mauro .....	900
Mr. Steve Clark .....	900
Mr. Jeff Leal .....	900
Mr. Victor Fedeli .....	900
Mr. Garfield Dunlop .....	900
Mr. Jack MacLaren .....	900
Mr. Steve Clark .....	900

## ORAL QUESTIONS / QUESTIONS ORALES

<b>Public transit</b>	
Mr. Tim Hudak .....	900
Hon. Dalton McGuinty .....	900
<b>Public transit</b>	
Mr. Tim Hudak .....	901
Hon. Bob Chiarelli .....	901
<b>Job creation</b>	
Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	902
Hon. Brad Duguid .....	903
<b>Job creation</b>	
Ms. Andrea Horwath .....	903
Hon. Brad Duguid .....	903
<b>Air ambulance service</b>	
Mr. Frank Klees .....	904
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	904
<b>Air ambulance service</b>	
Mme France Gélinas .....	905
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	905
<b>Women's issues</b>	
Ms. Dipika Damerla .....	905
Hon. Laurel C. Broten .....	905
<b>Air ambulance service</b>	
Mr. Frank Klees .....	906
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	906
<b>Automobile insurance</b>	
Mr. Jagmeet Singh .....	906
Hon. Dwight Duncan .....	907
<b>Long-term care</b>	
Mr. David Zimmer .....	907
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	907
<b>Air ambulance service</b>	
Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer .....	908
Hon. Deborah Matthews .....	908
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. Michael Prue .....	908
Hon. Dwight Duncan .....	908
<b>Energy policies</b>	
Ms. Helena Jaczek .....	909
Hon. Christopher Bentley .....	909

Continued on inside back cover







